

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET
FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

OCTOBER, 1913

The Brotherhood of Worlds. EUGENE D. DANIELS	481
Special Privilege. JAMES REED	500
The Doctrine of the Grand Man and Social Problems. JOHN R. SWANTON	512
The Religious Outlook and the Mission of the New Church. AXEL LUNDEBERG	525
The Origin of Knowledge. WALTER B. MURRAY	536
A Partial Study of a Lost Arcanum. WILLIAM McGEORGE, JR.	550
The Word as a Whole: II. The Israelitish Age. JACOB E. WERREN	576
Editorial Department:	594
The Spiritual Content in the Philosophies of Eucken and Berg- son; Social Problems; "A Partial Study of a Lost Arcanum."	
Biblical and Doctrinal Studies:	609
The Inception of the Law; Religion and Life; The Relation of Religion to Life.	
Current Literature:	624
Loofs' What Is the Truth About Jesus Christ; Sprague's The Book of Job; Kent's Life and Teachings of Jesus; Churchill's "The Inside of the Cup"; Recollections of Alexander H. Stephens; Trine's "The Winning of the Best."	

BOSTON:

THE MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET.

50 CENTS A COPY.

ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas.

\$2.00 A YEAR

(POSTAGE TO CANADA 12 CENTS, AND TO EUROPE 25 CENTS EXTRA PER ANNUM.)

The New-Church Review

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is the lineal descendant of the *New-Jerusalem Magazine*, which was established as a monthly periodical in 1827. In 1893 it was believed that a quarterly review of the progress of the church and the world, allowing for longer articles and a more comprehensive treatment of subjects, would be of greater service. The form was therefore changed and a characteristic title adopted. The field to be covered has been the same for this long period now approaching a century, but greatly changed and ever changing more swiftly. The light in which it is viewed is from the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, unfolding as they do the spiritual meaning of the Holy Scriptures and fulfilling the prophecy of the Lord's second coming to save mankind.

The REVIEW is seeking to set forth these principles, which are represented in the closing chapters of the Word by the symbolic New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven to a new earth (Rev. xxi, 1, 2). It is endeavoring to show their application not only to the organized New Church but also to the world in this period of transition and upheaval that is ushering in a "new era" of thought and life. In this effort it has been supported by able writers both in this country and abroad; and with such success as to call forth warm commendations.

The Board of Editors, as now organized, consists of the Rev. H. Clinton Hay as managing editor, and of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite and Mr. B. A. Whittemore; with the Rev. James Reed in an advisory capacity.

\$2.00 A YEAR. SINGLE NUMBERS 50 CENTS.

Postage to Canada 12 cents, and to Europe 25 cents extra per annum.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin Street,

Boston

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XX.]

OCTOBER, 1913

[No. 4.]

THE BROTHERHOOD OF WORLDS.

WE would call attention at the outset to the grand truth, that the quality of humanity is stamped upon everything. Nothing can be known or thought of that does not in some way refer to man. Do we look at the solid elements of the earth? They are for man and may be found in his physical body; they are in the blood, in the bones, and in the different tissues. The first faint forms of life look upward and aspire to man. The tree breathes through its leaves and has a circulatory system which is simply the arterial and nervous system of the human body in its simpler and ruder form. The animals resemble man—some of them so closely that certain philosophers think that they are almost human. Nature herself, considered as a whole, is a stupendous man—not as to shape, but as to function and use. As such she has her physical body and circulatory system. The rock-ribbed hills are her bones, holding her in firm consistency like the bones of the human body; the loose and movable soil is her flesh; the streams, both those under and those above the ground, are her veins; the ocean is her heart; the atmosphere is her lungs; the clouds and rain-storms are her arteries; and the water is her blood, purified in her atmosphere or lungs, flowing down to refresh her body through her rain-storms or arteries, and kept in perpetual circulation. Thus nature speaks of man. The attribute of humanity is stamped upon everything. Noth-

ing can be named but has reference to man. External nature is a grand anthem that sings of man—man—man. We might say that external nature everywhere is man—not as to shape, but as to principle and use.

If now we ask the question, whence is this quality of humanity which we see stamped upon everything, reason answers, that it must be from some infinite source—it must be from Him who is the only man; that is, from Him who has in Himself the source from which are derived all those qualities of humanity which we see stamped upon all things of universal nature both in general and in particular. This is the Lord Himself. He then is man. He is the only man,—that is, the only source of all derived humanity. He only has hands, in the sense of being the supreme source from which all hands are derived. So with the feet and all the other members and organs of the body. He only has love and wisdom in Himself, in the sense of being the supreme and only source from which all our love and wisdom are derived. Thus the Lord is the only real and absolute man—the only source from which is derived the quality of humanity that pervades everything. It is because the Lord is the supreme and only man—that is, because He possesses all the qualities of humanity in an infinitely perfect degree—that the quality of humanity is stamped upon universal nature. Nature exhibits the character and quality of her Creator.

Now the question arises, May we not expect to find this same quality of humanity stamped upon the civil and social affairs of men, or upon men in their civil and social capacities? If the quality of humanity is stamped upon external nature and upon individual man, is it not stamped upon men in their collective capacity? Are not men in their collective capacity when regarded as a community, a state, or a nation as much under the care and power of the Lord as external nature or the individual man? Are they not more so? Are not their relations to each other more complex, are not the issues greater, in proportion to their numbers? Shall we expect to find God in external nature and in the individual

man but not in history? Is there not vastly greater reason why men in their collective capacity should be subject to the Divine power than why external nature or individual man should be? We may be sure that the Lord has more to do with communities and nations than with the external universe and individuals. Indeed, universal nature, has been created and universal nature exists, only for the sake of the Lord's dealings with man, especially collective man. External nature and individual man are far inferior and less perfect than collective man. Shall we find then that the Lord from Himself has stamped the quality of humanity on nature and on the individual man and not expect to find the same quality stamped on the community and society? Nay, we may with far greater reason expect to find that communities and nations are social organisms—that they are but larger men. And so we find it. For are not certain individuals called the back-bone of the community, state, or nation? are not certain others called the brains? certain others the heart? and so on until, if our knowledge were only minute enough, we might appropriately liken every class to some particular organ or part of the body.

Every corporate community is but a man in larger form. Indeed, the very word, *corporate* means body, or that a community is to be regarded as an organized body. Thus our very language—the very terms we use with reference to communities and nations, implies that we regard them as men in larger form. Every town or city or nation is a human being in larger measure, and each one possesses an individuality or personality which is as peculiar to it as the personality of any individual is peculiar to him. Take the city of Boston as a whole—it has an individuality which is peculiar to itself, and people feel it when they go there. The personality of New York, or of London, or of Paris, or of New Orleans, is as different from that of Boston as the personality of one man is different from that of another. So it is with every little town and village. Each and every one has a distinct individuality as a town or as a village, just as men have as men. Is not the aggressive, energetic

personality of Great Britain acknowledged by the term "Johnny Bull"? Was it mere chance that occasioned the American Nation to be represented by the large, tall, gaunt figure of Uncle Sam, the embodiment of the nation's good natured forbearance and conscious strength? That is its personality. Thus we see that communities and nations are but men in larger form. The quality of humanity is stamped, not only on nature and individual man, but also on man in his collective capacity as a community or nation.

This great truth is acknowledged by many of our best thinkers, speakers, and writers: Says Henry Morley, "Because the character of man appears in the State unchanged, but in a larger form, Plato represented Socrates as studying the ideal man himself through an Ideal Commonwealth." Both Webster and Worcester define the state to be "a community of people united in one body politic." Herbert Spencer, the philosopher, teaches that the State grows like an animal; that little by little it becomes more complicated like an animal; that the parts of a state, or the different classes in a community become more and more dependent on each other like the organs of an animal; that, as an animal continually takes on new particles of matter, and puts off old and worn out particles, so the State is continually receiving individuals by birth and parting with them by death; that, as the different organs of a living body have different uses, so there is a division of labor among the different classes of a community; and that, as the living body has different classes of a community, and that, as the living body has its distributing system, so does the body politic. Says Professor Clifford, "That society is an organism, the highest of all, is one of those great facts which our own generation has been the first to state rationally." Says Sir James Stephen, "The strong metaphor, that we are all members one of another, is little more than the expression of a fact; a man would be one outside society as little as a hand would be a hand without the body."

Such are some of the testimonies of eminent thinkers that the body politic is a social organism, a real man in larger

form. These quotations might be multiplied to almost any extent, but enough have been given to show that the greatest minds grasp the important truth that society is a larger man. The attribute of humanity is stamped, not only upon nature and upon the individual man, but also upon society as a larger man.

In this connection there is one very important point to which we would call special attention—and that is, that when the community or nation is called a larger man the expression is not a mere figure of speech. It is not mere simile or metaphor but fact. It is not that a community is simply *likened* to a man, but that it *is* a man, only in larger form than the individual man. One answers to the other exactly. Just what the organs of the human body are to each other, that, in a more important way, the different classes and departments in a nation are to each other. Calling the nation a man does not grow out of a mere figure of speech—a mere comparison of things with each other, it is grounded in the deep philosophy of the universe. The same Lord, the Infinite and Perfect Man, possessing in infinite perfection the human qualities of love and wisdom, He who is the source of all finite humanity has stamped that humanity on external nature and on individual man, and He has stamped it also on social or collective man. Society is in the human form just as really and actually as man himself is in that form. Calling the community a body politic is no more a figure of speech than is calling man's physical organism a body material. Viewing the community as a living organism is no more imaginative than viewing man's body as a living organism. Both are facts and have their origin in the same creative source as all other natural facts. The physical body of man is human because the Lord creates it so; and the community is human for the same reason. The same Divine Creative Force, itself humanity in perfection, works itself out and manifests its human qualities in a nation of men as well as in individual man and in nature. That society, not as to shape but as to operation and use, is a larger man is not comparison, it is

fact, and some of the authorities above quoted acknowledge this. In the light of what has been said we may therefore, regard the community as a man in larger form, having a circulatory system like that of the human body, certain individuals being its eyes, certain others its ears, certain others its brains, its spinal column, its feet, and so on with every organ of the body.

But let us extend our thought. The Lord's creation has no end and its principles are of endless application. They appear in the smallest and lowest forms, and rising higher and higher and extending wider and wider, we see these principles continually appearing. They are wrought over anew in ever widening extent and ever increasing perfection. There is no point at which they stop, no point at which they have reached their largest and most perfect manifestation. There is always something beyond, always something greater and grander. He who has stamped humanity upon external nature, upon individual man, and upon a nation, has stamped it upon the world of nations, and will one day bring it to perfection. All the nations of this world in the aggregate are but a man in larger form—a diseased man at the present time, but in process of healing. This is acknowledged by the increasing prevalence of peace principles and by the ever increasing appeal to arbitration instead of war in the settlement of international difficulties. It is acknowledged by the present agitation for the establishment of a permanent international court of arbitration for the settlement of difficulties which arise between nations. It is acknowledged by the new philosophy of this new age in which we live. And it is acknowledged by the poets; for the true poets are always, however unconsciously, philosophers. Says Burns in his well-known lines:

It's coming yet, for a' that:
When man to man the world o'er
Shall brothers be for a' that.

Says Tennyson in "*Locksley Hall*":

For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,

Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;

Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;

Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly
dew

From the nation's airy navies grappling in the central blue;

Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder storm;

Till the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were
furled,

In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.

There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.

Yes, the time will come when this whole world of nations and peoples shall be a man in larger form—not diseased as now, one member or nation not acting against another as now, but each and all together acting for the common, world-wide good, even as each and every member of the human body lives not for itself but ministers to the whole, and in so doing receives its just return.

But shall we stop here? Shall we not extend our thought so as to include the whole universe of worlds? Is not that universe itself but a man in larger form? Do not the people of each world sustain the same relation to the whole that each organ and member does to the human body? This is the doctrine of the *Maximus Homo*—the universe as the greatest man. Is not the quality of humanity stamped upon the universe of worlds as really as upon one world or upon one individual man? Is not the Creator the same in largest things as in least? Can we stop short of regarding the whole universe as a vast, aggregate human being, the people of one world serving as its eyes, those of another as its heart, those of another as its brains, and so on?

But some one may raise the objection that science teaches that the planets and worlds of space are not inhabited.

Yes, and so science taught that a steam carriage could not be driven on two iron rails at the rate of forty miles an hour—proved it to a demonstration. Nevertheless the steam carriage has come to stay. Science taught that the steamboat was impossible, that the electric telegraph was impossible, that many other inventions which we now use were impossible.

Why does science teach that the planets and sidereal worlds are not inhabited? Because these planets and worlds are without atmospheres—or at least without such atmospheres as that of our own world. But, even granting that this is true, is the Creator compelled to create human beings in every world with lungs just like ours, made to breathe an atmosphere precisely like ours? Is the Lord's arm shortened and limited to the creation of any particular type of humanity? No, even in this world He does not make all creatures to live and breathe alike and in the same element. He makes the fish to live and breathe in the water, which is but a denser atmosphere, so dense that man dies in it. He makes the majestic eagle to live and breathe in an atmosphere so high and rare that should man attempt to live in it the blood would gush from his nostrils. And cannot He who creates and adapts His creatures to live in different atmospheres in this world do the same in the whole universe of worlds?

Oh, but science has constructed the wonderful lenses of the telescope, which reveal that the moon is a dead world, that it has gone through its ages of life and become solidified, and our own world is approaching the same end! The camera has given us pictures of the moon and these pictures show extinct volcanoes and many other signs of death. But can we place confidence enough in these pictures to say positively that what they reveal are in fact extinct volcanoes? The writer has a picture of a muddy channel, perhaps two rods in width, but the picture represents it as a beautifully rippled stream, perhaps forty rods wide, with several bathers in it. The farther bank is really of soft, sticky, muddy clay, but the picture represents it as a beauti-

ful wall of solid rock. Now if the camera can deceive us in so near and familiar a scene as this may it not deceive us with respect to the far distant moon and its objects, which are so little known to us? Besides, scientific men with all their wonderful knowledge, even with the aid of the telescope, have never seen, and cannot see, but one side of the moon; and how can they say positively that there is no life on the side that never presents itself to their vision? From these considerations we may see that scientific men ought not to state too positively that other worlds than ours are not inhabited. To make such a statement is saying altogether too much—more than the facts in the case warrant.

On the other hand, some one may say that the writer ought not to declare too positively that other worlds than ours are inhabited. He does not. No such statement can be found in what he has written. He is only showing that it is reasonable to believe that other worlds than ours are inhabited—that it is in harmony with universal law. He neither affirms nor denies positively and dogmatically, but only points out the reasonableness of the doctrine that other worlds than ours are inhabited, and that the whole universe of worlds is bound together by the invisible ties of human brotherhood—ties of which we are unconscious—and that each world is a member of the universal body.

Why not? Can anyone suppose that the Lord has created the innumerable worlds of space merely as lights in the sky to give light to our own little earth, or that He would sustain dead worlds in such grandeur? The great masses which revolve through space are not empty balls, created merely to revolve around the sun and transmit their scanty light for the benefit of men. No, they are for a far grander purpose. The end of creation is man—angelic man—the formation of a heaven from the human race. But what would a heaven of people drawn from our own little earth be to the Infinite Creator to whom a myriad earths are as nothing? He who will form an infinite heaven of purified men will have an infinite variety of worlds from which

they may come. The universe of worlds is the seminary of heaven.

Can anything be too great, to be the work of a God who is Infinity itself, and whose attributes are all infinite like himself? Can any multiplicity of worlds be too numerous, which are created to furnish inhabitants for His heavenly kingdom, to satisfy the cravings of His infinite love and the desire which such love must ever feel, to communicate good and blessing to continually increasing multitudes forever and ever? (Noble's Lectures, p. 452.)

But it may be asked, How can the worlds of this vast universe be interrelated so as to sustain the same relation to each other as the different members of the human body and constitute a stupendous living organism? We might as well ask how the different planets and worlds can influence each other by their attraction and repulsion. Take the moon and our own earth, for instance. Now that the moon, though about two hundred and forty thousand miles away, has a very marked influence upon the earth and her tides is an acknowledged fact of science. Thus two worlds can influence each other by their mutual attraction or repulsion. But is it not just as reasonable to suppose that the aggregate minds of different worlds can influence each other? Suppose that some distant planet is inhabited, cannot the general mind of that planet and the general mind of our own earth have a spiritual attraction or repulsion for each other as really as the physical masses of the two planets? Nay, may not the physical attraction or repulsion which two planets have for each other be, in fact, the outward correspondence of the mental attraction or repulsion of the peoples of the two planets?

Not only is this true in general, but it is true in each and every particular. For instance, if the earth and the moon have an attraction for each other as a whole then each and every minutest particle of matter in the earth must have its proportionate attraction for each and every minutest particle of matter in the moon, and *vice versa*. If the earth and the moon influence each other in mass or as a whole then the same influence must exist between every particle

of matter in the earth and in the moon. That influence may be infinitesimal but the Omniscient mind perceives it. And so, if the whole people of one world and the whole people of another can influence each other in the realm of mind, then the same must be true of the individual inhabitants of those two worlds. Mind knows no space. Scientific men have demonstrated by a large generalization of facts the doctrine of thought transference from one mind to another, though long distance and solid walls intervene between the two persons. By the action of light, heat, electricity, and other agencies, the sound of a football or of a spoken word has its proportionate effect throughout the material universe as really as the peal of a thousand thunders. And so, by means of mental laws and through subtle media not yet generally known, each thought of a person's mind goes out through the whole universe of minds like the ever widening circles from a stone dropped into a placid sea. Thus is it reasonable that all mankind are one, in howsoever many worlds they may be scattered; and that, regarded in their universal aspect, they constitute one stupendous human brotherhood or body politic, with a world here as its sense organ, another there as its memory, another yonder as its heart, and so on.

It may be asked, What particular use does our own earth perform for the whole universe of worlds in the aggregate? Let us look at this a moment. The one great, prominent characteristic of this world is its sensuousness, or the important part which is played by the senses. Here men first learn by seeing, hearing, and using the senses generally, nor can they learn in any other way. Here writing has existed from the very earliest times, first on the rind or bark of trees, next on skins or parchment, afterwards on paper, and lastly by types in printing. By this means the Sacred Scriptures could be written and preserved so that men could learn from them by the use of the senses. Here some grand manifestation of God must be made to men's senses or they could have no adequate idea of Him. Here the prevailing form of scepticism always is sensualism—that is,

refusing to believe anything which cannot be ascertained and known through the senses. Here men are excavating ancient and ruined cities, digging into the roots of ancient languages, boring into the bowels of the earth, journeying to either pole, exploring unknown lands, and ballooning above the clouds—all that they may see for themselves, by the use of their senses, some new thing. Here the favorite method of reasoning is the inductive method, or that which first gathers a large array of facts by the use of the senses and then classifies them and draws conclusions from them. In this world the sciences are founded upon observation by the senses. Here also all the great religions are such as appeal very powerfully to the senses. The heathen worship the sun and other objects of nature; or, when they do not worship natural objects, they bow down before artificial ones such as images which appeal to the senses. In Christendom the most numerous, most powerful, and the most effective, churches have an elaborate and impressive ritual which makes a strong appeal to the senses. Our painting, statuary, and architecture, our public buildings, our parks, our homes, our education, yes, even our poetry and literature, appeal to the senses; and too frequently, perhaps generally, they go no higher; they do not educate the higher planes of mind, but stop in the senses and make that the end which should be only the means. From the very first, as represented by the story of Eve, man has had to beware of the deceptive serpent of sense. It is safe to say that the one general tendency of people in this world, when left to themselves, is to become absorbed in the gratification of the senses. It is a sensual world.

May we not see from this what province this world occupies in the vast universe of worlds? Is it not the province of the senses? May we not see what use this world performs for the vast universe of worlds? Is it not precisely the use which our senses perform for us as individuals? The universe of worlds is a vast and stupendous man and our own world is the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, and skin of it.

Of course, supposing other earths to be inhabited, we are

to regard the people of every world as having senses, but they do not depend upon their senses as we do. They are not grounded in them as we are. With the people of other earths the senses do not preponderate as with us. Relatively to the other worlds, the people of our own earth are the senses of the universe. It is here as it is with man and woman. Woman has understanding, but in her affection preponderates, and so we call her a form or embodiment of love. On the other hand man has affection, but in him the understanding preponderates, and so we call him a form or embodiment of understanding. Just so, all worlds of the universe have their faculties of sense, but with the people of our own earth the senses preponderate; and hence, relatively to all other earths, our own earth is the sense organ of the universe. Our earth performs the same use to the whole organic form of worlds that our senses perform for us as individuals.

We are now in a position to perceive why the incarnation of God in humanity has taken place on this earth and on no other, and of what use this is to the people of other earths. It is a well-known fact, acknowledged by scientific men, that a person can have no idea of anything that he has not seen, or heard of, or sensed in some way. A man blind from birth can have no idea of color, a man deaf from birth can have no idea of sound. So it is with everything else. To have an idea of anything man must either see it or have it described to him or liken it to something that he has seen. Man could have no idea of God unless God had manifested or revealed Himself so that man could learn of Him through his senses. But this the Lord has done on this earth. This world is preeminently the world of the revelation of God to the senses. Here the Word is written and printed. Here God became incarnate. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory." As therefore our eyes see and our ears hear for our whole man, so God was manifested here that this earth, relatively to the whole universe, might see and hear for other worlds. As, when our eyes see and our ears hear,

all our interior faculties receive the benefit, so the people of this world have beheld God manifest, and all other worlds feel the thrill and are brought into a different state thereby. As our interior thought cannot apprehend God unless the idea begins by our learning of Him through the senses, so the worlds of interior intelligences could never have had the clear conception of God which they now have if the senses of this world had not beheld Him. The Lord said to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen thou hast believed; blessed are they who have not seen and yet have believed." Blessed are persons and worlds of a more interior genius, who can believe without being tied down to the senses.

It is a little remarkable that while science has far outstripped orthodox belief in most things, yet with respect to the habitability of other worlds science remains just where orthodoxy was a hundred and fifty years ago. The old theology taught that the sufferings and death of Christ are a satisfaction offered to Divine justice, so that God can consistently pardon the sinner on the sinner's repentance. An ancient ruler once made a law against a certain offence, prescribing as a penalty that the offender should have his eyes put out. Unfortunately, the king's own son was the first one to commit the offence. What was to be done? The king wished to pardon his son and save his eye-sight, but if he did so his subjects would see that he did not respect his own law, so the king put out *one* of his own eyes, and one of his son's eyes. On the same principle the God-head, in the second person of the trinity, suffered and died to show that God respected His own law, and so can pardon the penitent without losing His dignity and self-respect. Such was the doctrine taught. But in view of this the question has often been asked, How about other worlds? Must Christ suffer and die in other worlds too, and for the same reason? If so, then must not the second person of the trinity have been busy from all eternity incarnating himself on different earths and suffering and dying to save sinners there?

To this orthodox belief has replied that other worlds

than ours are not inhabited; and, strange to say, science has joined hands with it. Or if some a little more rational than others have believed that other worlds were inhabited they have held that these are not fallen worlds and hence do not need a redeemer. But that other worlds have not fallen into sin is a pure and unwarranted assumption. They have not indeed fallen into sin as our own world has. They are not so sensual, and have not fallen so low. They are of a higher genius, and their fall is different. But fallen they have. For, if we will but consider a moment, we shall see that it is impossible to create a world of people without the possibility of their falling into sin. No being of a rational and immortal nature can be created without freedom of choice. Freedom to choose between good and evil must have been an attribute of the rational inhabitants of all other earths as well as of ours. The people of those earths are under no necessity to turn from good to evil, and yet it is quite likely that some will do so; and thus it is a matter of the highest probability that evil, to a greater or less extent, has appeared in other earths than ours. In those worlds as in ours, no matter how good man may be naturally at the start, that good cannot be accounted to him as virtue. He must be placed on probation that he may develop a character for himself; and in so doing it is strongly probable that some will incline to evil. It is doubtless true, therefore, that other worlds than ours are fallen worlds. But if so, are they redeemed by the redemption which was wrought on this earth? To be sure. And if we consider what that redemption is, we shall see why it is so.

The redemption wrought by the Lord Jesus Christ was not a redemption from the wrath of God but from the power of hell. He did not buy men back from the curse of God, but broke the power of hell over them. The human race was under the power of hell—that is, under the power of all fallen intelligences in the aggregate. The minds of men were so swayed and possessed by this evil influx that they were blinded to the truth and had no moral

power to turn to the Lord. The Lord Jesus Christ simply broke the power of hell over them and restored them to freedom and rationality, so that they could look to Him and receive strength to overcome their evils. "For this purpose was the Son of God manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil" (1 John iii, 8). And again, it is said "For as much as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death; that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. ii, 14, 15). Such was the redemption wrought by the Lord Jesus Christ. It was a breaking of the power of hell over mankind, and a breaking of this power once for all.

But do not the inhabitants of other worlds receive the benefits of this? If the power of hell is broken once for all can it ever assert itself again? And if the power of hell is broken on this lowest, most sensuous, outermost earth of the Universe, is it not broken in all other worlds? If the enemy has been conquered in his strong-hold, in his worst form, in his greatest power, can he ever assert himself in lesser power? If the enemy can do nothing successfully—if he must finally be beaten in this lowest, most sensual world of all—what can he do in worlds which are of a more interior and better genius than this? And thus it is that the Saviour's words, "I am he that liveth and was dead, and, behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen, and have the keys of hell and of death," proclaim deliverance to the whole universe of worlds.

With this agree the teachings of the Scriptures and of the apostles. Paul says that by His Son God made the worlds (Heb. i, 2). Of course I am aware that the original of this phrase "*made the worlds*," will bear the rendering "*established the ages*," but at bottom it means the same thing, as can easily be shown. Again we read in John, "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made" (John i, 3). And are not the myriad worlds of space among these "all things"?

And not only as to creation but as to the grand outcome is this doctrine of a plurality of worlds acknowledged. The Lord says, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Other sheep I have—people of other worlds. There shall be one fold and one shepherd—the whole universe of worlds gathered into one—one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, even the baptism of the Holy Spirit. These passages do not state positively that there is a plurality of worlds, but the doctrine is implied in them and wrapped up in them. Again, we find Paul saying, "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in the heavens and which are on earth" (Eph. i, 9, 10). In another place Paul speaks of his preaching to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Eph. iii, 9-11). Again he says that the Lord "ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things" (Eph. iv, 10). In the Colossians he speaks of the universality of the reconciliation by Christ as follows: "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things to himself; by him I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven" (Col. i, 19, 20). And as if to acknowledge that the attribute of humanity is stamped upon this great work he says, "Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv, 13).

God's work is one. As a community is a body politic, so

is the vast universe of worlds—diseased now it may be, but finally to be healed and presented as a glorious human form. As in a community certain ones are its eyes, others its ears, and so on; so it is with the vast universe of worlds in their relations to each other.

The lessons drawn from these considerations may be summed up as follows:

This doctrine should teach us *broadness and catholicity* of thought. In the presence of a doctrine of such magnificent scope how can we be bigoted and narrow? However necessary, perfect, and of Divine origin, any church organization may be, we must not limit God's saving grace to that organization. The sheep-fold of our Lord is larger than any church, larger than any nation, larger than any world. In the church in any nation of Christendom, or in the world itself, His words are true, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." The Lord works in ways which are not seen by the natural eye. Through the Church, through the Lord's having foothold in the Church, He may reach those out of the visible Church; and by means of His having foothold on this earth, He may reach with His saving grace the people of other earths. The humanity of all nations and of all worlds gathered into one is the only true ideal of human destiny. God's infinity is manifest in the largeness of His works, and as we study the Divine economy, certainly nothing should be farther from our minds than narrowness and bigotry.

Again, from this doctrine we should learn *humility*. In view of the vast universe of worlds gathered into one and regarded as one stupendous body, how can any individual assert his own self-love and seek to bend the family, society, the community, the world, yea the universe, to the service of himself? Is not such a course of life absurd in the very extreme, to say nothing of its sinfulness? Should it not make us blush for very shame? What can comport with the vastness, the stupendousness, the magnificence of God's works but the most sincere humility on our own part as

individuals? How utterly blind to, and forgetful of, the infinite grandeur of the universe is he who asserts, in whatever manner, his own little individuality! Ought we not rather to repent in contrition and tears, and say, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? I am but a tiny speck in the universe, yet thou hast created me to fill my place; Lord, let me find it, and there let me live, however humble the use I have to perform; knowing that in so doing I shall attain to the highest and fullest measure of felicity." "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars that thou has ordained, what is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him?"

And finally, let us learn the lesson of *human brotherhood*. "No man liveth unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself." We are all bound together by invisible ties. No one should regard the things he possesses as his own. His service and his possessions belong not to himself but to humanity. This is the only way to a true individualism. Is not the hand more a hand, more its individual self, by acting not for itself but for the whole body? So with every person and every class of society. He who lives not for himself but devotes his service and possessions to the general good becomes the recipient of the richest blessings in return. He becomes more perfectly his own true, individual, highest self. Powers are developed within him which are above rubies. In the words of Paul, "Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it" (1 Cor. xii, 26). Like a majestic river, calm and deep, no longer with the impetuous rush of earlier days, nor profoundly stirred by passing breezes, augmented by numberless tributaries, bearing upon its bosom ships full freighted with blessings to humanity, flowing down to the ocean only to return again in the clouds and refresh the very soil which gave it forth; so may our lives not center in self, but flow outward in service for others—ever outward into the infinite universe of God; and we shall find that, though the clouds hover over us, he that loseth his life for Christ's sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it.

EUGENE D. DANIELS.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE.*

WE hear very much at the present day about special privilege. The term is generally used in connection with the external condition of men, and is applied to those who are supposed to enjoy worldly advantages denied to their fellows. Certain groups or classes of human beings are called privileged, because their outward circumstances are such as, presumably, to make life easier to them than it is to others. They are born perhaps to inherited wealth. They never feel the pinch of poverty. Their lives are spent in ease and luxury. They have no apparent cause for anxiety about the future, nor are they obliged even to work for a living. Wherefore they are regarded as particularly favored among men.

Special privilege is an expression which generally centres in money, and the things which money can buy. It seems to have had its origin in labor unions, or among persons similarly situated, who are dependent on others for wages. Capitalists are considered privileged as compared with laborers, masters as compared with servants, employers as compared with employed. The privileges are assumed to extend in all directions, so as to include greater opportunities not only for acquiring riches, but for social enjoyments of every kind, and an enviable position in the community. Chief among them is supposed to be unlimited leisure, with freedom to be as idle as one chooses. On these grounds a widespread feeling exists, that there are a fortunate few whose worldly circumstances set them apart from the rest of society, and make of them a class by themselves, to which the usual cares and worries are unknown. This belief gives rise to serious discontent, and to a protest against wrongs which, it is claimed, ought to be righted in the name of jus-

* See editorial on "Social Problems" in this number of the REVIEW.

tice and humanity. The subject is one well worthy of careful study and analysis; for it plays no small part in the discussions of the day. That any portion of the community should be thus favored above every other portion, seems flatly to contradict the principles of freedom and equality by which the present age, and our own country in particular, are professedly distinguished. If there are any privileged classes among us, does not the Declaration of Independence, which is the acknowledged charter of our national existence, appear to be set at defiance?

This question is in its essence as old as human history. Since men began to live together on the earth, there have always been external distinctions among them, which could not be surmounted. And so will it be to the end of time. This necessity arises from the fact, that no two of them were ever created alike, or placed in identical circumstances. Each has his own peculiar characteristics, which are never exactly the same as those possessed by another. The consequence is that, while there may be frequent resemblances, there are no duplicates, in the great family of man. Personal identity and complete individuality are never wanting. The reason for this fact will be further considered later. Suffice it now simply to mention the fact itself. Differences invariably exist, for which no man is responsible, and which no man can prevent. Some are born with greater physical strength than others, some with greater mental vigor. Some are afflicted from birth with defects of body or mind; others are free from them. Inequalities of one kind or another are everywhere to be found. No talisman has ever been discovered which would obliterate the line between varied outward circumstances, as, for instance, between poverty and riches. Our Lord's declaration, "The poor ye have always with you," has proved itself incontestably true thus far in the world's experience. If all material possessions were today divided equally among the inhabitants of the earth, the conditions would be changed tomorrow. And this not for the reason that there might be injustice and oppression on the one side, with weakness and

ignorance on the other, but because of the diverse inborn traits of human character. In the very nature of things mankind must at all times consist of those who are at least relatively rich, and of those who are relatively poor. Nothing else is to be expected; nor, we may add, is any thing else to be desired.

It should be needless to say that reference is not here made to abject and distressing poverty. That is an unqualified evil and should always be treated as such. Whether it be due to the idle and vicious habits of those who suffer from it, or to unavoidable circumstances, it is equally an evil not to be slighted in any well ordered community. The worthy poor must be as far as possible relieved, and the unworthy compelled to labor. Our subject bears no relation to those who lack the necessities of life and are therefore entirely dependent. But the question before us is that of society in its normal condition, apart from the recognized evils which may exist in it. Is there anything inherent in our present social order, which gives just cause for complaint? Are there flagrant inequalities among us, which need to be remedied? Do some men enjoy special privileges, of which others are unfairly deprived? If so, what are they, and how shall they be removed?

As we have already seen, if any single test is applied to human beings, absolute equality is impossible. The varieties and limitations of nature always stand in the way. In spite of all we can do, some will be taller and some shorter, some stronger and some weaker, some more active, and others more sluggish. This man will excel in certain faculties; that man in certain other faculties, and no two will be alike or equal in any one particular. Even the sum total of qualities possessed by each will vary; so that some will be fitted to fill places of larger usefulness than those occupied by others. At least, some places will be more prominent in the general view. Nothing can be truer than that there are born leaders of men. The time will never come when human society does not need to be organized. In other words, some form of government is always necessary.

And this means that there must be order and subordination. There must be those who hold positions of authority, and those to whom are appointed humbler kinds of service. For this diversity of function different persons are adapted. In conforming to it they obey a law of nature itself. Heretical as it may seem, we are obliged to confess that men are not created equal, in the ordinary sense of that term. Nor, again, as has been shown, do they come into the world on the same level with each other, as regards their outward environment and opportunities. The doctrine of the Greatest Man is illustrated here, as everywhere else. Just as the earthly body of a human being consists of almost numberless organs and members, from the largest down to the least, so is it with the body politic. There must be men in higher and lower stations, corresponding to the major and minor duties which need to be performed. All these duties are honorable, all are necessary; but they cannot properly be called equal. Again I ask, is there then any special privilege among them?

Our answer is, that this depends entirely upon the point of view. If the point of view be correct, there is nothing in the natural order of society as above outlined, to suggest partiality or favoritism. If the point of view be wrong, the inequalities which so plainly exist, will seem unjust and deplorable. The point of view is determined by a man's own state and feelings. What are the motives which actuate him? What are his foremost objects of desire? By what standard does he measure true success in life? According to his answer to these questions will be his point of view. If his governing purpose is to rule over others, to amass wealth, to hold a high social position, or to be admired and flattered by all men, he will, of course, be dissatisfied, when these results are not achieved by him. He will think that fortune is partial, and that some of his neighbors are treated better than himself,—awarded special privileges which he is not permitted to enjoy. The effect is to make him discontented, ill-tempered, and envious.

But on the other hand, he whose chief aim is to live unselfishly for his fellow-men, and to do them all the good he can, in the ways for which he is best fitted, stands on a different platform, and his outlook is wholly different. He seeks a reward which would give no pleasure to the man with whom he is contrasted. The one desires for his special privilege what the other is indifferent about. So, as was said, no definite conclusion can be reached in the matter, until we have found the right point of view.

An old proverb says, "Comparisons are odious." And most certainly they are, when they are made in an unworthy spirit. The real question involved is that of the ruling love. If the influence which dominates our lives is love of self and the world, the spirit is sure to be unworthy. The comparisons which we then make are for the sake of complaint. Their purpose is to prove how much better others fare than we ourselves. According as this point seems to be established, we feel aggrieved and injured; in which case comparisons are indeed odious,—and not only odious, but the prolific source of unhappiness. But if we are governed by love of the Lord and love of the neighbor,—those cardinal principles of heaven and the Church,—our effort is to learn for our own guidance what we can from the example of our brethren, and to see wherein we have cause to rejoice at their prosperity. These two positions are the exact antipodes of each other, and show how comparisons may or may not be odious.

But, in reality, the important point at issue is not so much one of greater or less, as of likeness and unlikeness. In the light of the truth that no two persons or things were ever created with the capacity to fill exactly the same place, mere outward comparisons sink into insignificance. Kind, rather than degree, becomes the leading consideration. To refer again to the illustration of the human body, how absurd it would be to speak of one of its organs as superior to another! Each is superior in its own function; but why raise a question as to the relative value of the functions? It would be quite senseless to say that the head is more excel-

lent than the heart, or the hand than the foot. The eye is not to be extolled above the ear, nor the flesh above the bones. All are indispensable in their respective ways, and all contribute to the perfection of the whole. The bond which holds them together is the law of use, the power of mutual service. There is no competition, still less contention, among them. They are all in truest order and co-operation when each is most fully itself, and does its own distinctive work the best. That brings life and health to the entire body. The case is the same with the whole natural creation. All things which God has made bear a certain relation to each other, minerals, plants, animals, and above all, man himself, in whom they are epitomized.

When therefore we think of human society as trying to become an organic whole, with all its parts working efficiently and happily together, we must first recognize their differences, as forming the very basis of successful co-operation. Those differences, rightly defined, are simply so many capacities for usefulness. You can help me, and I can help you, just in the degree in which we are different, and are adapted to different kinds of service. If this division of labor involves certain outward distinctions, we must cheerfully admit the fact, and acknowledge that there is no way of preventing them. Orderly government, for instance, as we have seen, is essential to all collective bodies of men, associated for a common purpose. A state or kingdom must have its chief ruler, with officials under him, in more or less subordinate positions. There can be but one king or president at a time. But that is no reason why his subordinates should not be perfectly contented, each in his own place. They must expect that he will receive the greater deference which is due to his office, and they must be glad to have it so. If his abode is a palace, and theirs are modest dwellings, they must accept the situation as pertaining to the fitness of things. If his emoluments are larger than theirs, so also is the service which he renders. The relation between him and them, and between them all and the rest of the community, is a mutual one, in which the

vital consideration is the fellowship of uses, and all external considerations are but incidental and secondary.

Numberless examples could be given of this principle. It is too obvious to require demonstration. What, in its essence, is an industrial corporation, but a body of persons organized for mutual helpfulness in some kind of service to the world at large? Some work with their heads, and some with their hands. Some direct and oversee the operations, others bring forth the visible results. There is nothing inherently antagonistic between these two classes. The real interests of the one are the real interests of the other. But they can never become an harmonious brotherhood, until this fact is fully recognized, and they are all inspired by the love of use, instead of the desire for their own selfish aggrandizement. The spirit in which work is done, not its mere outward form,—the satisfaction felt in doing it, not the mere money return,—is what decides its true quality. All labor is perfunctory and joyless, without this higher compensation. But, with it, every useful occupation is found to have its own special privilege. That privilege is the opportunity offered to those engaged in it to exercise their own best powers for the welfare of society.

Swedenborg, in his posthumous treatise, "The Doctrine of Charity," brings out this point most clearly and beautifully. He says, "Man is born that he may become charity; and he cannot become charity, unless he perpetually does the good of use to the neighbor, from affection and its delight" (n. 96). Then further the teaching is, "Every man who looks to the Lord, and shuns evils as sins, if he sincerely, faithfully and justly performs the work that belongs to his office and employment, becomes a form of charity" (n. 99). Under this last heading our author gives thirteen examples of employments common in the world, and shows how charity is properly exercised in each. Of these let us select two, namely, the man of business and the workman. Concerning the former his language is:

If he looks to the Lord and shuns evils as sins, and transacts his business sincerely, justly and faithfully, he becomes charity. He

acts as from his own prudence, and yet trusts in the Divine Providence. He is therefore not despondent in misfortune nor elated with success. He thinks of the morrow, and yet does not think of it. He thinks of what should be done on the morrow, and how it should be done; and yet does not think of the morrow, because he ascribes the future to the Divine Providence and not to his own prudence. Even his prudence he ascribes to the Divine Providence. He loves business as the principal thing in his vocation, and money as the instrumental, and does not make the latter the principal and the former the instrumental, as many of the Jews do. Thus he loves his occupation, which is in itself a good of use, and not the means rather than the occupation. He does not indeed so distinguish between them; but yet they are so distinguished when he looks to the Lord and shuns evils as sins. For he shuns avarice, which is an evil and the root of many evils. He loves the common good while loving his own good; for the former lies hidden within it, like the root of a tree, which conceals itself in the earth; from which, nevertheless, it grows and blossoms and bears fruit. Not that he gives to it of his own beyond what is due; but the fact is that the public good is also the good of his fellow-citizens (whence indeed it arises) whom he loves from the charity of which he is a form. One cannot know the secrets of charity within himself; for he cannot see them; but the Lord sees them. (n. 108.)

Regarding "charity in workmen" we are taught as follows:

By workmen are meant operatives and artificers of various kinds. If they look to the Lord and shun evils as sins, and do their work sincerely, justly and faithfully, they become forms of charity—each in proportion as he loves his work and is earnest in it. For their works are goods of use, serviceable to the neighbor for various necessities and uses; as, for food, for clothing, for protection, for preservation, for pleasure, and in many other ways, and are the gains of the commonwealth. Just so far as any one puts his mind into his work and labor, from the love of it, he is in it as to affection and thought concerning it; and, in proportion as he is in it, he is withheld from thinking of and loving vanities, and afterwards is led by the Lord to think of and love goods, and also to think of and love the means to goods, which are truths. It is not so with one who applies himself to no work. Every workman who looks to the Lord and shuns evils as sins shuns idleness, because it is the devil's pillow, shuns insincerity and fraud, and shuns luxury and intemperance. He is industrious, sincere, sober, content with his lot, and works for his neighbor as he would for

himself; because in doing his work he loves himself and him in equal degree. (n. 109.)

Thus plainly are we taught that the true reward of useful labor consists in the very joy of performing it. That reward attends every kind of human service, however lowly it may be. No other recompense will ever bring real and lasting satisfaction. A business man may heap up natural riches without limit, knowing not who will gather them; but unless he loves them for "the good of use" (to quote again Swedenborg's expression), they will not make him happy, but he will continually thirst for more. The restless workman may be repeatedly successful in striking for higher wages; but if all the time he looks upon his work as pure drudgery, and not as the delight of his heart, he will still remain restless as ever. Truly does our Lord say, "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." Rather does it consist in his habitual state of mind under the influence of his ruling love, which, according to its quality, leads him either to "seek first" his own selfish interest and pleasure, or "the kingdom of God and His righteousness."

New-Churchmen do not need to be told that the kingdom of God—which is heaven—is a kingdom of uses. This is a fundamental teaching of their religion. The whole heaven, and each society in it, is organized under the Divine law of mutual service. For this reason governments are necessary, not unlike those which exist on earth. Thus we read:

Because heaven is distinguished into societies, and the larger societies consist of some hundreds of thousands of angels, and all within a society are united in similar good, but not in similar wisdom, it necessarily follows that there are also governments; for order is to be observed, and all kinds of order are to be guarded. But governments in the heavens are various, of one sort in societies which constitute the Lord's celestial kingdom, and of another sort in societies which constitute the Lord's spiritual kingdom; they differ also according to the ministries of the different societies. But in the heavens there is no other government than the government of mutual love, and the government of mutual love is heavenly government. (Heaven and Hell, n. 213.)

After explaining the differences between the governments in the celestial and spiritual kingdoms, Swedenborg goes on to speak of the governors and the kind of authority which they exercise. He says:

From these things it may be evident what sort of governors there are, namely, that they are in love and in wisdom more than others, and thus from love will good to all, and from wisdom know how to provide for its being done. Such governors do not rule and command, but minister and serve; for to do good to others from the love of good is to serve; and to provide for its being done is to minister. Neither do they make themselves greater than others, but less; for they have the good of society and their neighbor in the first place, and their own in the second place: what is in the first place is greater, and what is in the second less. And yet they have honor and glory; they dwell in the midst of the society, in higher position than the rest, and also in magnificent palaces. They also accept this glory and honor, not for themselves, but for the sake of obedience, for all there know that they have the honor and glory from the Lord, and that on this account they are to be obeyed. This is what is meant by the Lord's words to His disciples: "Whosoever would become great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you, let him be your servant; as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister" (Matthew xx); "He that is greatest among you, let him be as the least, and he that is chief, as he that doth minister" (Luke xxii). A similar government also in least form is in every house. There is the master of the house, and there are servants; the master loves the servants, and the servants love the master, so that from love they serve each other; the master teaches how they ought to live, and tells what is to be done; the servants obey and perform their duties. To perform use is the enjoyment of the life of all; from which it is evident that the Lord's kingdom is a kingdom of uses. (Heaven and Hell, nn. 218, 219.)

In this heavenly picture we have the only true pattern for human society in this world. Does any one affirm that it is visionary and impracticable for men of the present day? If it were, then has the holy city descended too soon,—the new revelation of Divine truth from the Lord has been made prematurely. But none of us can believe that such is the case. The outward effects of the forces which we know to be at work in the world of spirits for the betterment of

mankind must needs become apparent gradually. Many obstacles need to be removed, before their operation can be free and unhindered. The mills of God always grind slowly. We must expect a period of unrest in the immediate future, continuing no one can predict how long, a period in which the clashing self-interests of men will be heard and felt as a constantly disturbing influence. But no sincere believer in the reality of the new heaven and the new earth now beginning to control all the fields of human endeavor can doubt for a moment what the final outcome will be. The heavenly principle of use will some time be recognized as the only possible way of unity and peace.

Is not this a practical principle? Can we not at once and always make it the guiding rule of our own lives? If it serves no other purpose, it may at least keep us from falling into all manner of wild schemes for reforming the world, which are necessarily futile because they merely touch on the surface of things. The simple knowledge of it should set before us the true ideal after which we must ever strive.

Swedenborg makes a definite application of this principle, not to heaven, but to this world, when he shows in the same little treatise on charity, from which I have already quoted, that no well-ordered government will tolerate an idle or useless person within its jurisdiction. His exact language is:

It is well known that every man is born to be of use, and that he may perform uses to others; and he who does not is called a useless member, and is cast off. He who performs uses for himself alone is also useless, though not called so. In a well constituted commonwealth, therefore, provision is made that no one shall be useless. If useless, he is compelled to some work; and a beggar is compelled, if he is in health. (*Charity, n. 77.*)

This statement is presented as a rule without exceptions. It applies to rich and poor alike. Every idle, able-bodied member of a community is an undesirable citizen, and ought to be set to work. His example and influence are pernicious, and hurtful to the state, which should therefore protect itself against him. This is plain speaking, and wor-

thy of most careful consideration. In it are involved certain other conclusions. One is, that opportunities for work shall never be wanting, if they can be provided in a legitimate manner. To this right every honest and industrious man is entitled. Should conditions at any time be such as to deprive him of it, the community is in duty bound to do all it can to secure it to him. Should those conditions be attributable to advantages unfairly gained over him by other men, they ought unquestionably to be dealt with by the strong arm of the law. Freedom to do his own best work in his own best way is the highest prize to be sought by earthly man. It is each one's special privilege.

JAMES REED.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE GRAND MAN AND
SOCIAL PROBLEMS.*

EMANUEL SWEDENBORG was not a sociologist in the technical sense, but in his conception of society as one man he has given us the true basis for all sociologies, technical or otherwise. The perfection of a human system of society should therefore be measured by its agreement with the organization of a perfect, healthy human being. Now a perfectly healthy human being consists in the first place of a soul, a mind, and a body, forming three successive planes; and in the second place of a number of organs and tissues which divide up the functions incident to life. This we know to be true of the body, and as New Churchmen we believe it to be true of the mind and of the soul. These differentiations exist thus on every plane of the human individuality.

Correspondently with the individual soul there is a world-soul which always contemplates ends, and is best described perhaps in so far as it is anticipatory as a great desire, and in so far as it exerts positive force as a great will. It is in other words the world's ruling love. The world's mind is its intellectual functioning, its thoughts, its discussions, its attempts to get at the realization of its desire; and it is the meeting ground on which the world-soul struggles with the world-body, endeavoring to subject it to itself. Finally the world-body, or "social body," is in the broadest sense the whole of human society as it exists on the earth; but as yet the consciousness of unity in this society has not reached beyond a certain limited number of nationalities. For the purposes of this paper it will be more convenient to consider merely that part of society embraced within one single nationality, remembering that

*See editorial on "Social Problems" in this number of the REVIEW.

it is only a part of the body of the Grand Man, but also that it and its problems are similar to mankind as a whole and its problems as a whole.

We may gain some idea of what a perfect human body should be by comparing bodies, eliminating the diseased and the imperfect, and selecting the most perfect feature in each for our ideal body. In the same way we may pick out the ideal mental features and the ideal soul features, in these two latter quests being assisted above all by the model incarnated in the Divine Man, Jesus. Similarly, in order to form an image of a perfect society we may compare the nations, governments, and societies known to us either in modern times or through history.

Swedenborg's comparison of the individual and the entire social body gives to New Churchmen, however, another means of comparison which is especially valuable, because the ideal individual is much more easily fixed upon than the ideal commonwealth. Of course there are diseased and imperfect bodies, and of course our ideal of the individual changes more or less from time to time, but this is rather in matters of outline; the great *plan* on which each individual is built is evident to all.

The first point to which the writer wishes to call attention in instituting this comparison is the great distinction which Swedenborg himself made in his works on the human body. Of his three chief writings on this subject one, the "Economy of the Animal (or rather Soul) Kingdom," treats of the fluids of the body, that is, the inter-communicating elements; a second, the "Animal (or Soul) Kingdom," treats of the tissues and organs independently considered, that is, of the vessels containing those fluids; while the third, "The Brain," deals with the coordinating organ of the body, that is, its government. In the first he takes up the blood and the subtler fluids, which he terms the purer blood and animal spirits; in the second, the skin, the alimentary tract, liver, pancreas, spleen, kidneys, lungs, and so forth; and in the third, the various portions of the brain.

Now considering separately the organs treated in the

"Soul Kingdom," we find that each performs some service for the entire body, and that it in turn benefits from the functions of the rest of the organs of the body; we find that, if it does not perform its functions properly the other organs suffer, and, conversely, if the other organs do not perform their functions properly this organ suffers. Furthermore, we find that each organ is composed of smaller units called cells, each of which contributes to the general work, and that the general work of each organ is efficient in direct proportion to the efficiency of the cells of which it is composed. Turning to the fluids of the body, and particularly to the most general of all on the lowest plane, the blood, we find that it is necessary to every organ, that it brings new life to each, and in turn conveys away also the worn out particles from each. And, as Swedenborg says in several places, great care is taken that just that amount of nutriment shall be drawn from the blood for an organ or cell that the organ or cell requires, no more and no less. There are ways provided against starvation and against repletion. This is the condition of a healthy body.

Again, the whole human body is brought under one government by means of a central office, or brain, whence messages are sent to all other parts of the body. By means of its nerves this central office determines and regulates the activities of each and every organ, and this is as true of those organs which, like the heart, are under the sub-conscious nervous system as of the muscles and bones which are moved at the behest of the will. Nevertheless, this control is not exercised without counter control on the part of the organs themselves. We might also say that the glands are assigned such an amount of blood as they send for, or that the skin and muscles send word as requisite for such and such actions. Also we know that the brain is powerless without organs with which to effect what it desires. The brain is not an autocrat over the body; it is simply that part of the body to which has fallen, in the division of labor, the function of direction.

Now, if the analogy of the human body is to serve as a

guide in accordance with the correspondence of its parts, and their coordinations, with those of the Grand Man, as Swedenborg teaches, the functions of the individuals who compose human society, and their relations to one another, can be seen illustrated. Among them in all their variety there must be the function of the central office, or government, to coordinate their activities—a government dependent, however, on the remainder of the constituents of the body politic. Certainly it is not a government that can exist independently of the support of the remaining members: nor is it one that can exist without performing its own proper duties to those members. Moreover, the form of society must be one in which every individual works for the common good and shares in the common acquisitions according to his needs. Be it noted also that, like the organs of the body, each does not receive his compensation independently of the others, directly from the outside world, but from the common center and distributing office of needed supplies, corresponding to the brain, he receives as much as is needed for his functions, and no more. Such must be the ideal state.

Now evidently this is not the form of the state at present. A certain moiety of the individuals composing society are compelled under modern conditions to support, not merely themselves, but also several other large bodies of people, namely: first, the poor, who from sickness, insanity, or incapacity are without resources and dependent upon others; second, the vicious, who exact a toll from society by fraud, theft, etc., and professional beggars and tramps. Any just way that can be devised to reduce their number, or make them contributors to the well-being of society, should be welcomed. Another class are they who are supported by invested funds. This is not intended to include individuals who draw salaries from invested funds, but rather the individuals to whom the invested funds belong. By the income of these invested funds thousands of persons at the present day are withdrawn from the responsibility of contributing anything

whatever to the world's work. Note, however, that it is not said that all such persons do not contribute anything to the world's work: for notwithstanding the bribe of idleness always alluring them, there are owners of invested funds who do their full share, and more than their full share, for the common good. There are nevertheless two sets of persons of this class who do not so contribute: first, those who live in absolute idleness; and second, those who spend their time and resources in purely dilettante avocations, fads or crazes, which often masquerade as labor, but are in fact nothing more than diversions. And the harm of having this portion of the world's workers withdrawn from usefulness becomes cumulative under the laws of inheritance now in operation, by which a man may will to his children, and they to their children, and so on indefinitely, all the property which he has acquired during his lifetime, no matter whether the acquirement has been the result of his own energies or of the common energies of the society with which he has been surrounded. Under such conditions it is no wonder that private fortunes have reached enormous sums, until now it is declared that three thousand persons own eighty per cent of the real and personal property of our country. When closely examined this is found to represent a fearful condition of affairs, and one that must end in revolution or in evolution of something very different and in closer correspondence with the condition of the Grand Man.

When "these United States" threw off their allegiance to the mother country it was believed that they had destroyed special privilege and established a democracy simply by destroying hereditary titles and granting universal manhood suffrage; but from the days of primitive men wealth and power have gone together. The power which goes with titles attracted wealth or was lost to the possessor; while wealth on the other hand, if continued intact long enough, attracted titles in one form or another—the titles which are the popular endorsement or symbols of power.

There would be, however, not the slightest danger either to individuals or the state from private ownership of money were it not for the one feature of interest, or in other words, if it were not for its use in the form of capital and the privilege granted it in that shape of levying a tax upon society. If money drew no interest it could preserve no one in idleness beyond the time when the capital was expended; and even for large fortunes this time would be measurable, while without interest or its equivalent large fortunes of any kind would in the future be impossible.

As interest on capital, whether in the common form or in the technically distinct varieties of dividends and rent, is considered not without reason as the very corner-stone of our present economic system, I wish to treat it with as much care as the space will permit. So accustomed are we to this particular institution that we think nothing more natural or just; and it will probably surprise most persons to learn that its legality has been freely admitted only since the close of the sixteenth century, the period of the Tudors. The Mosaic law absolutely forbade interest as between one Israelite and another, and while interest might be taken from the gentiles this exception was of a piece with the general attitude of the Hebrew state toward everyone beyond her borders. It thus happens that the Psalmist describes the perfect man as "he that putteth not out his money to interest," for while it is true that our popular version says "usury" instead of "interest," the ancients made no such distinction, all interest with them being usury and all usury interest. Sometime before the coming of our Lord, Rabbi Hillel had in a measure sanctioned the institution, and it is to be suspected that this was one of the "traditions of the elders" which Christ denounced as having made the laws of Moses of none effect. In Greece and Rome interest taking gradually developed a plutocracy, and often reduced the poor to literal slavery.

Plato says of it:

The most hated sort [of money making], and with the greatest reason, is usury, which makes a gain out of money itself and not

from the natural use of it. For money was intended to be used in exchange but not to increase at interest. And this term usury [tokos] which means the birth of money from money, is applied to the breeding of money, because the offspring resembles the parent. Wherefore of all modes of money-making, this is the most unnatural. (Politics, I, 10, 4, Jowett tr.)

Cato, on being asked what he thought of usury, asked the speaker what he thought of murder.

The teachings of the early Christian Fathers were to the same effect. Chrysostom says:

Nothing is baser than the usury of this world, nothing more cruel. Why, other persons' calamities are such a man's traffic; he makes himself gain of the distress of another and demands wages for kindness as though he were afraid to seem merciful; and under the cloak of kindness he digs the pitfall deeper by the act of galling a man's poverty. (Homily on St. Matthew.)

And again:

How many have lost their principal for the interest's sake! How many have fallen into perils for usurious gains! How many have involved themselves and others in extreme poverty through their unspeakable covetousness! But what is the plea of the many? When I have received the interest, I give to the poor, one tells me. Speak reverently, O man; God desires not such sacrifices. Deal not subtly with the law. Better not give to a man than give from that source; for the money that hath been collected by honest labors thou often makest to become unlawful because of that wicked increase; as if one should compel a fair womb to give birth to scorpions. And why do I speak of God's law? Do not even ye call it filth? Why, are there not many honest trades—in the fields, the flocks, the herds, the breeding of cattle, in handicrafts, in care of property? (Homily LVI.)

Basil enlarges at still greater length on the same subject. Council after council forbade interest, especially on the part of the clergy, but it was gradually allowed even by the common law though still condemned in principle. Early Protestantism also condemned interest, often in unmeasured terms. The usurer's house was the house of the devil. One per cent was enough to cut out the kingdom of heaven. Luther is quoted as saying "To exchange anything with anyone and gain by the exchange is to steal."

Interest was forbidden as late as the time of Edward VI, but, beginning with the time of Henry VII the effort was rather to control its rate, and so it has been ever since. Calvin was the first Protestant thinker to allow it, and Locke, Hume, Adam Smith, and Jeremy Bentham argued that it was justifiable. Bentham's celebrated argument was that the effort to condemn interest simply raises the rate of interest. Men at times must borrow. The lender does a real service to the borrower. Under equity he is entitled to some reward or interest. If all interest is forbidden he will then secretly ask a higher rate of interest because of the risk run. It is also argued by those of this school that the attempt to control interest places useless and harmful checks on the natural flow of commerce.

The institution of interest and its equivalents has, however, had opponents in every period since it was made legal, John Ruskin for instance having argued that the owner of a house had no moral right to receive one penny more from it in rent than he had put into it.

Swedenborg does not attempt to enter into a minute discussion of economic problems, his references to interest and usury being rather with regard to their spiritual significance. Nevertheless the implication is condemnatory. Thus in *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 9210, we read, "A usurer is one who does what is good for the sake of gain; for a usurer entrusts money to another for the sake of usury, and brings aid to another for the sake of gain." In *Apocalypse Explained*, n. 967, he says "By thefts . . . are also meant thefts not manifest, as unlawful interest and profits. In *True Christian Religion*, n. 432, however, we find this: "The private duties of charity are also numerous, such as the payment of wages to workmen, the payment of interest, the fulfillment of contracts, the guarding of securities, and so on, some of which are duties by statute law, some by common law, and some by moral law."

We find, therefore, on the one hand a universal disapproval of the custom among all ancient and not a few modern writers, and on the other a steady spread of the

institution and many eminent defenders of it within the few last centuries.

The writer believes that both sides are in a way correct. Under present conditions what Bentham says is eminently true. Men do at times need money and they do not always have friends able to render them assistance. The private capitalist is the only person to whom they can turn in their emergency. The money is borrowed, the crisis tided over, and in course of time the borrower returns the principal, and having paid for it, is under no further obligation to his creditor. This is the brighter side of the picture, however, and to one who has seen the darker side the ancient and world-wide opposition to the institution can readily be understood. For, looked at in the best light possible, interest-taking is bound up with two conditions harmful to mankind as a whole: (1) it involves the taking advantage of one person's necessities by another, even though to him it may be the lesser of two evils, and (2) as already pointed out, it is the fruitful source of unequal opportunities.

When a farmer raises a bushel of wheat or a miner digs a ton of coal each adds value to the wheat and the coal because each has put labor into it, and again, when the railroad takes these products to another city and the retailers pass them on to the consumer more value is added, because more labor is put in. But if at any point in the course of their transfer to the consumer any tax is levied upon them not in payment for actual work such tax is an exaction levied by some person or persons who have a monopoly in something needed in the production and transportation of the said articles. While it may be impossible to abolish such exactions under present conditions, it is self-evident that they exist contrary to order and should as soon as possible be abolished. Such a tax is brought about by the private ownership of capital, and the taxes which private capital levies we call interest and dividends, and, when invested in land and buildings, we call them rent; only in the last case it must be assumed that the rent exceeds the original cost and the annual upkeep of the property, for other-

wise the rent merely represents an exchange of uses. Every stage in the production and distribution of the wheat and the coal, which I have taken as examples, involves labor—and consequently the product appears with added value through the direct work of the laborer—except one, and that one is the exaction of its tribute by capital. The farmer works, the miner works, the railroad crew work, the coal dealer works, and each is paid for that work. The capitalist, however, is not paid for his labor but merely for the use of something he has and which industry needs. He is not paid for something he *does* but for the use of something which under present conditions he is allowed to *own*.

The capitalist is thus set free from the necessity for work and in many cases he accepts this freedom. But whether he becomes an idler or not the fact remains that he receives an income independently of any service rendered by him. If, in spite of the absence of necessity, he still performs a service he is paid for that in addition, or at any rate the payment (income) he receives is not in return for his labor but without any reference to it.

There appears to be but one remedy for this condition of affairs. To abolish interest by law would ruin industry and could not be thought of for a moment, but without in appearance changing the institution in the least the present unequal condition can be done away with by the substitution of collective capital for private capital. It would then make no difference what interest collective capital received or whether it received any interest at all. It would remain in either case in the hands of the **population** as a whole.

Under present conditions the **man** who borrows pays money into private hands and this money may be carried miles from the place where he lives and be expended upon some luxury of no social service. And if in course of time the borrower becomes financially ruined the care of him falls, not upon his creditor, but upon society collectively. Under co-operative finance he would borrow his money from society and by the tribute he paid to it lighten the

social burden and strengthen that very agency which must assume the care of him in case of his failure.

Not only will the socialization of "the unearned increment," in whatsoever form it occurs, turn an additional proportion of the population to productive labor, but a still larger class now living on fees and percentages for duties of questionable utility will be set free for productive labor along with them. In consequence of this change there should be an increase in the rural population, cities should fall off or spread out over much wider areas in proportion to their population, slums disappear, and the cost of living come down everywhere.

Swedenborg's reference to interest in True Christian Religion, n. 432, can in no manner be understood as an endorsement of the institution. Whatever his private views may be the man of today is enmeshed in a net of custom and usage from which he can free himself in only the slightest degree. He must at times borrow and he must agree to pay interest on the money he borrows. Under such circumstances it is as much a "private duty of charity" for him to keep his word and pay the interest as if the institution of interest were of Divine origin. His duty in such a case has nothing to do with the validity of the institution as such.

One great defense of private capital, apart from that based on the necessity that every man is under of earning a living, is the additional necessity of providing support for his wife and young or defective children in case of his death. But all, rich and poor alike, are under this necessity; and it is much more fairly met by a system of national insurance than by private investments which in the nature of the case are unequal.

We have also to consider, of course, endowments of churches, schools, universities, hospitals, and other institutions. What would become of the Carnegie-endowed libraries, for instance, if the iron and steel industries were to be owned and operated collectively? In answer we may ask, What happens when one is requested to contribute to

some object, of the advantage of which he is well aware? He contributes. But, as a matter of fact at the present day he contributes, without willing it and without knowing it, to our libraries and other endowed institutions, through the advanced prices he pays for what he buys, or through the lower wages he gets for his labor; and we may rest assured that with all the profits of our labor, and with all our purchases at actual value, we could take care of every institution, and every humane cause, that is really worthy. Nor should we lose sight of the added power of society which would result from the enlistment in active usefulness of those who are regarded as beneficiaries of our present system, but who in idleness or in the dissipations of pleasure-seeking are its real victims.

This brings us to an important point with reference to all modern social reform movements. They have often been originated by men who were agnostics, if not atheists, owing perhaps to the shortcomings of the churches of their times, and in consequence justice on the material plane was all at which they aimed. Such being the case their chief consideration was the redistribution of wealth in such a way that the rich shall lose and the poor shall gain. From this point of view arise the fulminations against wealth and the wealthy with which the literature of many of these reform movements abounds. Believing as we do in the New Church, that material well-being is not the supreme end of existence, we know that no real reform can be carried out that will not benefit all, rich and poor alike. And so in this case the abolition of private ownership of capital, while benefiting the poor materially and paving the way for spiritual benefit to them, will also benefit those who now hold capital; for in the first place it will remove that great incentive to idleness which an excessive income furnishes, and it will give to many of the emancipated rich a taste of the pleasure which comes from useful labor in the service of their fellow men. Moreover it will relieve the energetic among them of a certain undeserved odium which attaches in the minds of many to the possession of wealth, and vindi-

cate the worth of those talents on account of which perhaps they are now wealthy. Such talents will then be used, not for the enrichment of themselves or a limited number of persons, but for all mankind, and may cease to serve selfish ends. It is a mistake to assume that the satisfaction felt by a successful business man, for instance, is in the wealth which his success brings him under existing conditions. As a matter of fact the satisfaction which the true Christian business man feels is not in the wealth which accumulates, but in the useful exercise of the peculiar faculties and gifts bestowed upon him by the Creator; and this will become more manifest to himself and others if the personal ownership in the capital employed is removed.

To recapitulate briefly: Money seems to the writer the blood of the social body, and private ownership of capital a device for the individual appropriation of that blood which should belong to the whole, an appropriation which has resulted in an apoplectic condition of certain parts of the social organism and an anemic condition of the rest. By putting an end to this disease in society, every part will become properly nourished, and every part will again become useful. Thus the world body will become a truer basis for the world mind and the world soul,—“a sound mind in a sound body,”—and along with this there will be an increase of sound individual minds and bodies into which the light and warmth of heaven can flow.

JOHN R. SWANTON.

THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK.

WE have during the last two years witnessed one of the greatest, most energetic, and best planned religious revivals the world has ever seen. Starting in Minneapolis this "Men and Religion Forward Movement" has invaded seventy-six cities from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific. Ministers, laymen, professional men, business men, laboring men, were enlisted in its ranks. Its avowed purpose was, among other things, "to win to Christ and the Church the largest possible number of men and boys—and to reveal the program of Jesus Christ to the world in such a manner that the strongest men will volunteer for life-service in Church."

Why should there be need of this so called "Evangelistic Engineering"? Are we not Christians? Is not the Christian Church after 2000 years' existence so well established among us as to be a permanent institution? Why then this fierce struggle for existence? If we are to believe one of the most prominent and active leaders of this movement, Prof. Fred B. Smith, there are very urgent reasons for this vigorous campaign. In his address to the Western Minnesota Methodist Conference this eminent speaker recently said:

We are in the midst of a crisis in the church. The Methodist Episcopal Church grew until six years ago; then it struck a dead level. The Presbyterians are facing the same trouble, as are most of the Christian churches. Protestantism for three years has been losing ground. . . . College men are forsaking the church. We have lost our hold on the masses.

And this situation is not confined to America. According to an article in the January number of *The English Review* the same conditions prevail in all the Protestant countries of Europe—indeed, the same magazine avers that it is not confined to Europe and Christianity, but is also

found in Asia among the adherents of all the great ethnic religions there.

As far as this country is concerned the "Men and Religion Forward Movement" was inaugurated to save the Christian Churches from utter ruin and failure. Its aim and purpose were, briefly speaking, to get men, and especially young men, to take an interest in religion again, and to go to church instead of to theaters and lecture halls, and often to something still worse. Without regard to expense every means that human ingenuity could think of was resorted to in order to accomplish this purpose. The churches and the newspaper press of the country, regardless of political differences, were in close co-operation. The work was well, thoroughly, and conscientiously done by good, well-meaning, honest, able, and self-sacrificing workers. It was, from a religious point of view, a praiseworthy enterprise.

And what was the effect of this gigantic effort to revive men's dying interest in religion and the church? A nationwide movement enlisting in its ranks scores of the ablest men the Church could muster, with unlimited financial resources at its disposal, certainly could be expected to work wonders. But what do we find? Scarcely had two weeks elapsed after it, like a religious cyclone, had passed over the city of Minneapolis, where it started, when our five hundred ministers began to question whether the effects and results were worth the colossal efforts expended on it. One of the ministers, according to reports in the daily press, complained that "there were hardly any men in his church; so few, in fact, that he had grave doubts whether their united efforts could make even an impression on the wedge," which the ministers were supposed to drive. "Most of the other pastors agree that this applies to the male members of their congregations," said the same paper. "They listen and listen but it never fazes them," said another minister rather in sorrow than in anger. Said M. P. Burns:

The Men and Religion Movement has come and gone, but now that it has passed things threaten to go back into the old humdrum

again. How are we to prevent this? Certainly no miracle or revolution has taken place as some fondly hoped. The church has not been re-vitalized, re-energized, changed for evermore. The proverbial lull impends that has always followed in the wake of great evangelists, who came, thundered, churned into fever, and went away.

This certainly does not sound like success. It rather points to failure.

And well may we ask, What is the reason that this great "Men and Religion Forward Movement" has shared the tragical fate of all the preceding great religious revivals? In looking for the reasons for its apparent failure most of our old church ministers seem to agree with the venerable ex-President of the Minnesota State University, Dr. Cyrus Northrop, that the churches themselves are to blame for the widening breach between them and the masses. "Let us do what Jesus did," he says, "go to them in a sympathetic, friendly way and tell them in love the truth of God! Jesus went about doing good. This is precisely what we must do if we would solve the problem." This would be more effective, he means, than trying to get people to go to church "and sit properly in a pew for a few years, and listen to theological discussions from the pulpit that have no more fitness for them than roast beef for a newly born infant."

This opinion of Dr. Northrop's seems to be upheld by facts. We find that the churches that are most active in doing charitable work have the largest attendance. Why is it that the Christian Science churches are crowded to the limit of their capacity? Is it not because they undertake to provide for their members' physical health and worldly success? Why has the Emanuel movement proved an attraction for the masses, so that even Jews, Chinamen, and Catholics, not to mention adherents of all Protestant sects, have attended the meetings of the churches that practice and preach spiritual healing? For the very same reason. And if charitable work and efforts for social reform were all the "Men and Religion Forward Movement" planned to do in order to draw the masses within the influence of the

church, then Mr. Henry Rood, the publicity secretary of the movement, might have some reason for the statement attributed to him, namely, that; "We are succeeding in getting Christianity out of cold storage." Which means, in his own words, that "The organization is lending its assistance in the campaign to abolish child-labor, to remove fire-traps, to provide meeting places and working-men's clubs in buildings not connected with saloons, and in every possible way to further the work of practical social service."

All of this is great and grand and glorious in its way. Everything that is done and can be done to abolish the three greatest scourges of the human race—disease, war, and poverty, certainly is worth doing, and deserves the approval of everyone who has a heart for the ills of suffering humanity. But the question is who should do this necessary reform work. Does all this activity in the secular field fall within the proper sphere of the Church? Is it the function of the church to enter into competition with labor unions? Should the church try to settle strikes and disputes between capital and labor? Should the church be one of our many charitable organizations? Should it identify itself with the temperance movement, or even with the efforts now made to fight the white slave traffic? Should the church enter into competition with physicians, druggists, restaurants, hotels, insurance companies and banking establishments? What does she gain by doing so? She may gain in membership, but does she also gain in spirituality and effectiveness in administering to the needs of men's souls?

A distinguished English clergyman is said to have overcome the scruples of an agnostic against joining the church by this significant statement: "The church to-day has nothing to do with what you believe." Whereupon the agnostic gladly had his name entered upon the church membership lists. The Church of England had one member more, but did the church in heaven also increase at the same rate?

In fact, by entering into competition with secular organizations the church gains nothing but loses much. By abandoning her original office of ministering to the spiritual

needs of the people, and placing herself instead in the ranks of social reform movements for the betterment of material conditions here on earth, she loses her distinctive character of a Christian church and becomes a secular institution, more or less successful in the measure that she is able to do more or less good to the greatest number of people.

And this is just exactly the goal towards which the old Christian churches of to-day are drifting. In an article on "The Decay of Dogma in the Church" by Joseph McCabe, which recently appeared in the *English Review*, we find the following prophetic diagnosis of the church situation: "In any case the emphasis will increasingly pass from dogma to ethic, from heaven to earth." And there are very few orthodox old-church ministers who would not subscribe to the following statement of Mr. Herbert Seely Bigelow, in a little pamphlet on "The Mission of the Liberal Church," that "this mission is the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth." And, as if apologizing for his position, he adds,

To make social betterment the chief concern of religion is no surrender to materialism—no attempt to save the world by machinery or to dispense with the spiritual dynamics of redeemed and inspired men. The mind must be illumined with economic truth. To invoke the spirit and to teach the way of social progress—this is the mission of the church that the world needs.

Consequently, the most popular churches of our time are those of the type of "The People's Church" in Cincinnati, whose minister is the most active factor in the "Traction Contest" in Ohio, and those churches in which socialism, single tax, or the like is preached.

This policy may be beneficial to the church from a financial point of view, but it certainly is lowering the standard of the Christian church. It is yielding to the materialistic tendencies of our time. It is making of the church a universal poorhouse, a universal hospital, a universal kitchen, or a universal banking house—an institution, in fine, where people may go to get all their material and physical needs supplied. All of these, however, are functions that properly

belong to secular society, and by invading that territory the church will ruin itself, sound its deathknell, proclaim its inability to hold the fort, and will admit (with the Anglican clergyman who always read the creed with this mental reservation, "These are the things people used to believe a few centuries ago") that we have lived to witness the end of the Christian religion.

The sad effects of this temporizing, this cowardly capitulation before the advancing forces of materialism, is never more pitiful than when it takes the form of sensational advertising to draw the obstinate crowds to the depleted houses of worship. In such cases there is nothing so low that some of our old-church friends will not stoop to it. Look for instance in the columns of one of our daily papers, where the Sunday topics of the ministers are announced. The following are culled from one of the Minneapolis dailies at random, all on the same day: "How should the Business of a Church be Managed?"; "Radium and the Radiant Light"; "How to Make your Vote Count"; "The Solution of the City Problem, presented by Dr. Strong"; "Basin and Towel"; "Book-keeping by Double Entry"; "The Path of Commerce"; "The Quest of Wealth"; "An Evening with H. Walford Davis"; "The Prize Fighter, Jack Johnson." Other ministers in their despair employ still more doubtful attractions. Some time ago a minister in Milwaukee, who was forced into a close competition with a theatrical show, advertised in the daily papers that at the close of his Sunday sermon he would perform a sleight of hand trick that no conjurer could beat; and as he charged no admission his church was crowded. A minister in Minneapolis this winter advertised that as an intermezzo during his sermon he would dance the "turkey trot" and the "grizzly bear dance." And he actually did so before an applauding and enthusiastic audience. Can we imagine a deeper degradation of the Christian church? Does it not remind us of the French Revolution when the poor little king had to don the red cap of the Jacobins, sing the Mar-

seillaise, and dance the "Carmagnole" at the bidding of the furious and intoxicated Parisian mob?

Against this sad degradation and secularization of the church all revivals, including the "Men and Religion Forward Movement," have proved powerless. The religious press of our country is wide awake to the condition. The denominational magazines are full of complaints about it. A recent issue of the *Methodist Review* has a thoughtful article by Dr. E. C. Wilm of Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas, on "The Present Religious Situation," in which the seriousness of it is frankly admitted. But the author apparently does not know where to look for the remedy, if there is any from his point of view.

But while the old churches are engaged in this fight for their lives, in vain trying to hold the ground that is constantly slipping away from under their feet, the New Church, or the New Christianity, can watch the process knowing what it means; knowing the necessity for it; and feeling that the time is not far distant when a new Volney will have enough material to write a book, not on the "Ruins of Empires," but on the "Ruins of the Churches," for in less than a generation, if this continues, only ruins will be left. For this process of secularization is going on at a rapid pace. The disintegration of systems of dogma, the abandonment of creeds, the dissolution of doctrinal structures and the substitution in their place of ethical standards applied to social reform work, settlement houses, neighborhood guilds, workingmen's clubs, colleges, and other institutions of learning—such, for instance, as the University of Chicago—are met by secular society in the establishment of rival institutions of the same kind, which may have the effect on the ecclesiastical body or bodies that homœopathic medicines have on our physical bodies, restoring them to health according to the principle "*similia similibus curentur*." Thus we may find that no sooner has the Catholic Church built a parochial schoolhouse in any populous quarter of a great city than the community sees to it that a public school building is erected in its immediate vicinity.

So the education of the young, which is one of the most effective feeders of the church, gradually passes from her to secular society. We shall find the same to be the case with another important activity, the dispensation of charity, which until lately has been considered an exclusive function of the Church. Thus we have "The Associated Charities" in all our great cities, managed by the city itself, or the citizens, and not by the Church. We shall find the same to be the case with the care of the sick—the churches have built and are still building expensive hospitals; but now we have city hospitals everywhere, and the poor and needy there receive care without charge. In fact, in every case where the Church enters upon educational, philanthropic or reform work, it is met by secular society with which it must engage in close competition, finally to give up the rivalry and leave the field in the hands of its victorious opponents.

While this flood of destruction is raging around us, the man of the New Church may look forward with hope and trust, confident that in due time the waters will recede and the new earth appear on which men will recognize and worship the Lord in His second coming. Old falsities with their attendant evils must be swept away before the ground can be cleared for the establishment and growth of the Lord's New Church. Of the outward development and manifestation of the church we are taught but little, still we are not without some information. Says Swedenborg:—

I have had various conversations with angels respecting the state of the church hereafter, and they said that they know not things to come, because to know things to come is of the Lord alone; but they know that the slavery and captivity in which the man of the church was until this time has been removed, and that now from restored freedom he can better perceive interior truths, if he desires to perceive them, and thus become more internal, if he wills to become so; but yet that they have slender hope of the men of the Christian church, but much of some nation distant from the Christian world, and therefore removed from infesters, a nation which is such that it can receive spiritual light and become a celestial-spiritual man. And they said that interior Divine truths

are at this day revealed in that nation, and are also received in spiritual faith, that is, in life and heart; and that they worship the Lord. (The Last Judgment, n. 74.)

According to this prediction the New Church will not attain to any considerable growth among the Christian nations. It will first become an ethnic religion in countries that are now pagan. May we be permitted to make a guess as to which of the pagan nations the angels have reference in the above quotation? The development of religious thought after the Lord's second advent in non-Christian countries is certainly most wonderful. Especially is this the case in India. May not the angels have had reference to this old mother of religions? The leaders of Brahmo Somaj, such men, for instance, as Keshub Chunder Sen, Mozoomdar, Nagarkar and others, are, indeed, more closely related to the New-Church sphere of thought than to any other movement in the religious field in our time. This is plainly manifested by the whole spirit and nature of the Brahmo Somaj movement. It is also clearly expressed in the literature of that movement which has reached the West. One of the leaders of Brahmo Somaj, Keshub Chunder Sen, says in his work, "India Asks Who Is Christ?"

Go to the rising sun in the East, not to the setting sun in the West, if you wish to see Christ in the plenitude of his glory and in the fulness and freshness of the primitive dispensation. Why do I speak of Christ in England and Europe as the setting sun? Because there we find Apostolical Christianity almost gone; there we find the life of Christ formulated into lifeless forms and antiquated symbols. But, if you go to the Christ in the East and his Apostles, you are seized with inspiration. You find the truths of Christianity all fresh and resplendent.

And the same man says further:

Verily, Jesus is above ordinary humanity. . . . "The nature of the Lord filled him, and everything was Divine in him. . . . The root of his being was God himself. . . . He had his life rooted in divinity. . . . He proclaimed unto the world the fact that he was one with God. . . . The New Testament commenced with the birth of the son of God. . . . The Father continually manifests his wisdom and mercy in creation, till they take the form of pure sonship in Christ. . . . The Father, the Son

and the Holy Ghost—Force, Wisdom, Holiness; the true, the good, the beautiful: sat, chit, ananda—(truth, intelligence and joy).” He is the chit-Christ, pure intelligence, the Word of God, mighty Logos. Beholding God in him and himself in God, he exclaimed, “I and the Father are one.” Christ struck the keynote of his doctrine in the formula “I and the father are one.”

And does not the following quotation from Mozoomdar, one of the disciples of Sen, who visited this country at the time of the World’s Fair in Chicago, sound almost as if taken from Swedenborg?—“A Divine Humanity, and the Son of God he (Christ) reigns gloriously around us in the New Dispensation.” Are we not justified in saying to religious leaders, even if outside of the Christian fold, who express New-Church thoughts in these words, “You are not far from the kingdom of heaven”?

The Most Ancient Church has perished, the Ancient Church is no more, the Israelitish Church has passed into history, and that the old or first Christian Church is slowly but surely sinking under the irresistible waves of another deluge is dimly, vaguely felt by some of its ablest men. One of the most popular ministers of Minneapolis, Rev. Andrew Gillies, pastor of the Hennepin Avenue M. E. Church, one of the largest, wealthiest, and most influential churches in the city, recently made this remarkable utterance in a sermon on “What is the Matter with the Church?”

There are more Bibles sold to-day than ever before, but there are fewer of them read. I believe this is the worst evil we have, and the real cause of the poor attendance in the churches. [And here follows a sentence which almost makes one think and feel that this minister, like so many individual members of the church he represents, is more or less consciously receiving the influx from the new heaven]. When the people of America read and grasp the full meaning of this wonderful book I believe all church troubles will for ever end, but not until then.

Waiting for the American people to fully grasp the meaning of that wonderful book of God, which can be nothing else than its inner spiritual sense, and while the secularization of the old church is going on around us for the higher purpose of forming out of the present chaotic conditions

the plane of justice and social righteousness coming to us from some now pagan nation, on which the Lord finally can be received, ours is the grand and glorious mission of being the nucleus, the remains, around which the New Church will finally grow to become an ethnic church even in the West.

When a former dispensation has perished the Lord has always provided a seed or germ, called in the Bible, "Remnant," and by Swedenborg, "remains," from which the new succeeding dispensation grows. As Noah and his sons were the remains from which the Noachic church grew, so are we the remains from which the New Church, the crown of the churches, grows. We are the embryonic heart and lungs of the coming New Jerusalem. The organized New Church therefore is the holiest and most sacred religious institution now existing on earth. It has a greater mission than any other organization ever had. To this little organization is entrusted the sacred guardianship of the writings that contain the Divinely revealed doctrines of the church that will never cease to exist, but will always continue to be the glory and the pride of the nations; the church that is so picturesquely described in the twenty-first chapter of the Revelation, the last book of the Bible; the church that will come in its fulness perhaps 500 years from now.

AXEL LUNDEBERG.

THE ORIGIN OF KNOWLEDGE.

As far back as our records go they show that people have been intensely interested in the origin of knowledge, and it is the purpose of this paper to try to bring together in some suggestive form the facts which Swedenborg, the revelator of the New Age, has given us.

The world wants light upon its problems, and among others upon the problem of the origin of knowledge, and if Swedenborg has anything helpful to offer upon the subject, let us listen patiently to what he has to say because of his unquestioned character and attainments. If what he says is worthy, and gives us a solution of the matter which commends itself to our reason as satisfactory, let us accept it at its face value and rejoice in our enlightenment.

The thesis to be maintained is that all knowledge—and by knowledge we mean all that we know, all things of sensation, reflection or more interior perception—is a matter of Divine revelation, either directly, as we usually understand the word “revelation,” or indirectly, as the Divine is self-projected into nature.

With this statement in view let us consider the first phase of our subject, which is, the method by which men first received knowledge.

Swedenborg informs us, from revelation, that the men of the Most Ancient Church who lived before the flood, described in parable in the earliest chapters of Genesis, the men of the Golden Age of the world, were created, as the animals still are, in the true order of life. And as the animals have a correct instinct, or instinctive knowledge, to guide them wisely in all the ways of their limited lives, so the men of that primitive time had an intuitive perception of truth, not only on the corporeal and sensual planes of bodily life as animals, but also on the higher, rational.

spiritual, and celestial planes of being; men were wise innately with Divine wisdom as the highest angels are.

The objects of the natural world about them, which are the projection of the Divine into the ultimates of order, served them as a basis or foundation upon which their lives should rest; but also, because these objects were created by the Divine and from the Divine, they represented, or symbolized, Divine things in general—the truths or principles of heavenly life, which is the life they then lived. As they looked out upon the material world about them they were conscious of a Divine influx into their perceptions of natural objects, which enabled them to know as angels know, by perception, or intuition.

This method of obtaining knowledge is similar, in some respects, to that of our own day. It is similar in the outward basis needed for the Divine influx, but different in the consciousness, not only of the influx, but also of its source in the Divine; and different because we do not understand as they did the signification of natural objects; different, furthermore, because they were born celestial men, with perception or enlightenment on the highest planes of being; whereas we see only in the light of nature faintly illumined by the light of heaven,—the very lowest plane of conscious being.

By means of dreams, and visions, and actual converse with angels, they also received direct revelation; but let it be noted for future comparison that this was also a method of receiving knowledge from without themselves, not subjectively.

Their language, and this statement is important, was at first unwritten and unspoken, except as it was written in the sun and moon and stars, in the everlasting hills, the valleys, the streams, and seas, in general as it was written in all the objects of the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, and thus recorded in natural symbols which they interpreted; and spoken only in the now lost ability to express in the face the affections and intelligence of the mind.

This statement is important because it accounts for two

phases of man's earliest development as noted by modern science, namely, that in the development of language there has been a growth from words expressive of simple natural objects to their analogous meanings on higher planes of mental life; which is the progress that would naturally have been made by men who thought in terms of natural objects as symbols, and needed as they degenerated in celestial perception to express themselves outwardly with more elaborateness. The second phase accounted for by this symbol-language is the claim of materialistically inclined students of man's religious development, that religion was in its beginnings, as far as traceable from its monuments of every kind, a nature worship, a worship of natural objects; which is precisely what this early knowledge of symbols became in its degeneration.

The men of the Most Ancient times from open perception of inner processes acknowledged the Lord to be the source of all their wisdom as well as of their good affections, and they were conscious of perfect freedom of action, a freedom granted them that they might be men and not mere automata; that they might voluntarily receive the Divine wisdom in their understandings and the Divine love in their wills and thus become recipients capable of reciprocating the Divine life.

But the day came when they desired to have a fuller sense of being their very own, not realizing so deeply their dependence upon the Lord, shutting out from their consciousness as it were the thought of life as a gift from above and thinking of it as resident within themselves. This turning from the Lord as the source of all, to themselves as a source of life, or rather this desire to do so, was the very first development of selfishness, the true origin of evil. It is portrayed in Genesis in the parable of the woman given to man as the affection of his wisdom but in such form softened and beautified and humanized; and the beginning of man's decline was thus minimized as far as possible by the infinite mercy of the Lord.

Then a day came when to this newly awakened selfhood

the appeal of the senses grew too strong; the things of the outer world pressed too heavily upon him, and man yielded to the suggestion that he might be wise and prudent of himself independently of the Lord. He would, so the senses typified by the serpent reasoned, be as a god understanding good and evil of himself. It was the temptation to enter into the things of highest knowledge through sense perception and reasonings thence, a most subtle persuasion from which man in his natural state has never since been delivered.

What did it signify? That man voluntarily shut himself off from the consciousness of his vital connection with the Lord, and of the influx of life and wisdom from Him. The loss of the perception which he had formerly possessed was signified by his removal from the tree of life. Unfortunately it meant far more—it meant his loss of Eden, his garden of delight, his pristine innocence, his surpassing wisdom. The process described in Genesis required long stretches of time. Man did not fall in a day, but the decline was gradual, and yet it was complete.

Swedenborg says of the men before the flood that they were of such a genius that the process of degeneration once begun they came in time to be imbued with direful and abominable persuasions concerning all things that occurred to them or that came into their thought. They were possessed with the most enormous love of self, and supposed themselves to be as gods, and that whatever they thought was Divine. No such persuasion has ever existed in any people. As their wisdom had at first been the innate perception of all truth resulting from the celestial love in their hearts, when that love was changed into monstrous self-love their wisdom became transformed into hideous falsities and phantasies. The Bible puts it thus: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." It was impossible to save such a race, and all except a remnant, named in the Bible Noah, were destroyed, literally destroyed themselves.

And it was possible to save Noah, or the salvable remnant called by that name, only by effecting a radical change in the method by which knowledge should thenceforth be received. Instead of conscious influx upon the highest planes of being into a celestial love which gave a celestial perception of all the objects of knowledge, which is the true and ideal order of life, it became necessary that man should be born absolutely helpless, with a mind apparently like a piece of blank paper. Thenceforth he was to receive his first impressions of life, his knowledges of things, apparently from the outer world, and travel slowly upward by a painful way to higher and truer knowledges; but it was the only way to save mankind, as we shall see later.

Now we shall try to obtain a glimpse of the creative principles of the universe in order to understand what is meant by spiritual influx. The universe with which we are acquainted by outward vision is the natural. Swedenborg tells us of the creation and operations of this external world in a way to satisfy us that as a scientist he was never excelled; and in his descriptions of the human body and its functions it is not too much to say that no one has as yet equalled him. All of this study of the natural universe and of the external physical body of man was to serve as a basis for understanding the spiritual, for it is upon the natural that the spiritual rests, into which it flows and through which it operates. The method by which it operates is called by Swedenborg the law of correspondence, and of this great law he alone tells us. We can refer to it only in passing, and add that it is one of the most important contributions to the understanding of the relations of matter and spirit ever given humanity.

We see with him that the outward objective world is only the clothing, the outer garment, of the spiritual world, which is even more real than the natural because actually living instead of only appearing to do so as it is acted upon. Just as the natural sun creates and sustains through its atmospheres the natural world, so the spiritual world has its sun which creates and sustains, instrumentally, not only

the spiritual universe, but also the natural universe with its suns and systems.

This great central sun of the spiritual world as to its heat and light is the first proceeding of the Lord and the containant of the creative forces of His Love and Wisdom. For all things are created from Love by Wisdom; Love being the essential quality of God and Wisdom His form. Spiritual heat and light, or love and wisdom, flow together from the Lord into the soul of man, love into his will and wisdom into his understanding, and in his mind produce affections and thoughts, and this spiritual influx from the Divine, thus proceeding into and through the mind, descends into the senses and thus enables us to perceive the objective world about us. The soul of man, which is a receptacle for the inflowing love and wisdom of the Lord, operating in the recipient as affection and thought, as it were creates its outer material body which it animates and uses as a medium for putting itself into touch with the material world.

No one has written more fully and satisfactorily of the marvellous intercourse between soul and body than Swedenborg. He has viewed it in all its phases, taken all the facts into consideration, and he gives us descriptions of it which could be given only by one who has seen the operations of the soul in its body from both the natural world and the spiritual—the only way in which a complete view of it could possibly be obtained.

Now let us take up the next step in our study and consider man as both a material and a spiritual being. We all are familiar with the outward material body, which we leave behind at death. But the spiritual body may need brief description. It is an organized form of spiritual substances, complete and perfect in every detail, and is that which holds the material particles of our earthly bodies in place. It is immortal. It never dies. It is ourselves, for even now are we purely spiritual beings, living in spiritual bodies. The spiritual body, not the material, has sensation. We are actually living now in the spiritual world, with all

our affections and thoughts not only from it, but in it. We see out, it is true, into the material world by means of our material bodies; but it is the spiritual man which is looking out through material lenses, and by the other senses coming into contact with the material universe. The spiritual man alone lives, and from the influx of the Divine love and wisdom, in part through the mediation of angels and good spirits, and of devils and evil spirits, and in part by a more direct influx from the Lord, receives all his affections and thoughts. We think of our affections and thoughts as originating within ourselves, but Swedenborg shows that they do not so originate, and that if we should be deprived for one single instant of this constant contact with the angels and spirits, that is, of the influx which flows down through them into us, we should fall dead. This is a surprising statement and hard for us at first to understand; it is only as we perceive ourselves to be merely receptacles of life that we begin to comprehend it.

Now, let us think for a moment of the orderly arrangement of man's mind and in what way he differs from mere animals.

The human mind is divided into different planes or levels, one above another. In general the division is into the natural mind and the spiritual mind. There are three planes in the natural mind and three in the spiritual. As we grow in the regenerated life we open up the spiritual planes of the mind; but we do not become fully conscious of them until we enter the spiritual world by the death of the earthly body.

It is therefore the three planes of the natural mind that we shall now consider for a moment only. But the natural mind must not be understood as material. It is called natural because it is closest to the natural, or material, body, but it is truly spiritual, although on a lower plane. Material substances are dead or inert, inactive, passive, acted upon. It is only the spiritual that actually lives.

The three planes of the natural mind are the sensuous, the scientific and the external rational. The lowest forms

of animal life are only in the sensuous plane, that of sensation; higher animals have also life on the scientific or knowledge plane, and the highest have a dim light from the rational; but since they all must act according to their desires, from its dictates, their intelligence is subservient to their will, a slave of it, and none of them can be truly called rational at all. Thus they cannot see truth as truth, but can perceive only dimly the way to fulfil their desires. They do not have the spiritual planes of life at all, from the opening of which alone man is fitted for heavenly life.

Man alone is truly rational as well as truly spiritual. He alone is truly intelligent. This is so for the sake of his reformation and regeneration. In his first estate of heavenly perception of all truth and of all knowledge, as we saw earlier in our study, he was intuitively wise; but when he lost the will that desired only the good, and used his intelligence to carry out and confirm the promptings of an evil will, he was destroyed by the flood of falsities which this evil intelligence had produced.

We shall now consider rationality and freedom, two terms often on the lips, and perhaps sometimes not definitely understood as to their method of operation and importance.

In the people called Noah, as we saw, it became necessary to establish a new process of becoming wise in order that man might be saved. That process was by enabling man to see things rationally, as in the light of heaven, independently of his will. Therefore it was that he was born into no instinctive knowledge of any kind, and began to receive from the outward world all impressions, into which the light of heaven poured as these knowledges were stored up in his memory.

Thus by means of the faculty of rationality we are today, and have been since the destruction of the Most Ancient Church, enabled to perceive truth as truth in the light of heaven apart from our evil wills. If we could see only the truths that are in accord with our degenerate wills or affec-

tions, we could never be lifted up above the animal, the purely sensuous, we could never comprehend or appreciate spiritual truth; genuine heavenly ideas would have no meaning for us.

Freedom is a faculty as indispensable to man's restoration to true order as rationality. It consists in the ability to desire, on a plane above his natural degraded will, the things which his rationality demonstrates to him as worthy.

By these two faculties of rationality and freedom, given now from the Divine mercy, and temporarily in inverted order—given as it were miraculously—man enters rationally into a perception of truth above the mere evidences of his senses, and is enabled to compel himself in freedom and from a higher plane of being to put the truth into practice.

Let us see how these two faculties of rationality and freedom operate in the matter of spiritual influx.

We said a moment ago that man lives in the spiritual world, for our lives are made up of our affections and thoughts, and affections and thoughts are both from and in the spiritual world; but man is externally conscious of no other world than the material one about him, except by direct revelation.

We have already learned that our affections and thoughts do not originate within ourselves, but from the influx which comes to us through those associated with us in the spiritual world, and those associated with us there, on the same plane of life precisely as ourselves, are good and evil spirits, who were once, and recently, human beings in material bodies here on earth. The good spirits, those who are in preparation for heaven, are in touch with and acting from angelic spirits and angels, who are in turn acting from the Lord. The evil spirits are those who are in preparation for the life they love in hell and are acted upon by devils who are already there. We must realize that as a rule neither angels nor devils come into direct contact with us, but only through good or evil spirits.

Now let us see how they operate upon us. The contents

of our memories form the basis of their influx, that is to say, good and evil spirits enter into the things of our memories, which seem to them as things in their own memories. They are no more conscious of their contact with us than we are conscious of our contact with them. But they think from the things in our memories and their affections are excited by them. Thus the influences of hell or heaven, as the case may be, flow into the things of our memories as they also exist in the minds of good or evil spirits and we seem to ourselves to have affections and thoughts.

And we do have affections and thoughts as we appropriate these affections and thoughts to ourselves; but they do not originate within us, but are only appropriated by us. That is why we say that we are not responsible for our affection and thoughts except as we make them our own. And here comes in the use and value of the faculties of rationality and freedom, for through our rationality we are enabled to examine the character and quality of our inflowing affections and thoughts and with our freedom to accept or reject them.

Let us note just here an important fact. As this influx comes to us it has in it nothing of the memories of those through whom it inflows to us, thus nothing of their facts; wherefore it is that nothing of direct revelation comes to us by this interior way, but only illumination, to illustrate with the light of heaven or the lumen of hell the things in our own memories.

Let us note also in this connection another important fact, namely rational or heavenly illumination come to all men, whether good or evil, for the sake of the uses which they may perform to society as well as for their regeneration. That is to say, it comes to all men, so far as they suffer themselves to be enlightened by reason. Thus it is that even evil men are permitted to see truth as it were in the light of heaven. But evil men are not willing to see truth in a permanent way in the light of heaven. So it is that to the extent of their inward opposition to the good the knowledge which they obtain is not true knowledge, for

they pervert it into falsities in order that it may accord with their evil wills.

This brings up the general subject of knowledges which enter into our memories to form the basis of influx, for we are beginning to realize that all knowledge is not worthily such, but some of it may be untrue, or only apparent knowledge.

Knowledge in its simplest form is the result of sense perception. The objects of the outside world which, as we remember, is always animated by the spiritual forces working within it, print themselves as it were upon our senses which are also alive from the spiritual senses within. These sense impressions in themselves, and stored up in the first or natural memory, serve as the basis for the spiritual influx of which we have been speaking. This spiritual influx is the light of heaven, in its essence Divine Wisdom. It illuminates the mind, enables us to take up the sense impressions that we receive from the outer world and view them in the light of reason—for spiritual reason acts in heavenly light.

But through our senses we also come into contact with other human beings and receive from them their additions to our knowledges. We likewise perceive the records of human thought and experience in books and in other forms of transmission. This knowledge which we derive from others has been obtained by them precisely as we have derived our own.

But among the knowledges which come to us it is necessary to distinguish two kinds, one primarily from man's experience with the world of sense about us, and another which we call supersensuous. Yet both come to us in an external way, and both are from the Divine. The sensuous is from the Lord reflected in nature, and the supersensuous is direct revelation. Together they form the basis for our own subjective life of thought, that is, for spiritual influx.

Let us sum up briefly Swedenborg's teaching concerning the origin of knowledge, to wit: Knowledges or ideas are the result of spiritual influx into the forms of the objective

world as perceived by the mind or spirit of man as he looks outward into the material world. These forms are stored up in the first or natural memory and serve for immediate or later use. They are of two kinds, sensuous or supersensuous, and they are both presented objectively to the mind in order to serve as a basis for spiritual influx.

With both kinds of knowledges, sensuous and supersensuous, we are familiar; for the sensuous is the reproduction in our minds, the reflection as it were, of the sensuous world about us, and the supersensuous is that which we derive from what we call revelation. The materialist accepts sensuous knowledge only; but mankind at large also believe in supersensuous knowledge. What we desire to emphasize is that supersensuous knowledge is also derived through the senses, and is also stored up in the memory objectively so that it may serve as the basis for spiritual influx.

The universal basis of revelation, of so-called supersensuous or spiritual knowledge, Swedenborg tells us, comes from the Golden Age, or the Most Ancient Church, upon the earth before the flood, whose records of heavenly knowledge also derived objectively are preserved, not only in our own Bible in their purest forms, but also in the monuments of ancient Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt. The celestial men of that ancient time, born into the true order of life, could communicate without spiritual injury with angels. The knowledges relating to God and heavenly things were thus universally known, but, as we have shown, even then procured objectively.

These knowledges were first gathered into unwritten "doctrinals" by those named Cain in Genesis. They were preserved in more enduring form by the people known in the Bible as Enoch, and so transmitted to the people known as Noah who formed the second general church age, or dispensation after the flood, known in mythology as the Silver Age, and in Swedenborg as the Ancient Church.

These knowledges were recorded in symbolic language, and this language was the first employed by the human race.

In its earthly objects, the reflex of the Divine, symbolized or corresponded to heavenly truths, which thus served as a basis for heavenly influx, becoming thus a language capable of containing Divine thoughts. It is still seen in the picture language of ancient Egypt and other countries.

These transmitted knowledges were gathered together into the Ancient Word, a revelation provided by the Lord to serve as a basis for the future supersensuous illumination of the race. Of this Ancient Word we have in our Bible, in addition to certain direct references to it, the first seven chapters of Genesis taken from it verbally. The four chapters which follow are also taken from it—perhaps less literally. These eleven chapters include in a parable the spiritual history of mankind up to the time of Abraham, when the narration of external history begins. These chapters are the same in general outlines as the traditions which universally prevailed among the nations of antiquity, showing the common source from which they sprang.

This Ancient Word was known wherever the Ancient Church, formed immediately after the flood, existed; and that church, we learn, spread over Asia, Africa, and into Europe. All religions thus flow from this Ancient Word, which formed the basis for heavenly influx or illumination in supersensuous things. From the perversions of its symbol arose idolatry. Then later followed our own Bible, written also in symbols, or by correspondence, adapted to the men of later ages. It is now to serve the race as a basis for illumination in heavenly things, and is also made up of objective knowledges adapted to the Divine influx.

Thus, according to Swedenborg, there is no such thing as natural religion, developing subjectively from the human consciousness through its experiences of life; all religion,—every idea of God or heavenly things—is from revelation. This is entirely contrary to the usual thought upon the subject, for many of us were taught that supersensuous ideas such as those of God and immortality flow into us by an internal way, or are born within us.

We have also been accustomed to think of the various

systems of philosophy as human reasonings from an innate perception of God and the supersensuous things of the soul. They have been attempts to understand the mysteries of the universe, but without the basis of revelation handed down to them by religion, acted upon by spiritual influx in the manner we have already described, they could never have risen above the contemplation of the merely sensuous world.

Thus we behold the theologian and the philosopher of every age at work attempting to confirm by reason, which is spiritual influx, the things of revelation. And we find him successful when he has been willing to seek for truth rather than for the justification of a perverted selfhood. But he signally fails when he attempts to reason concerning supersensuous things merely from sense perception,—when the materialist admits only the half of knowledge, the sensuous excluding the spiritual, we cannot admit the result of his reasonings. True knowledges of supersensuous things come from revelation alone confirmed by reason.

This ability to see in heavenly light, in a permanent way and with increasing fulness of perception, results entirely from putting away evil, or the life of self. As we grow in heavenly character we grow in heavenly wisdom. The basis of this heavenly wisdom or true knowledge is the Bible as we put it into practice in our daily lives. It provides a better basis than every other kind of memory knowledge derived from whatever source; in fact, the only basis that will make us truly wise. We see as a conclusion that in order to come back into our lost estate of heavenly perception it is necessary to foster a heavenly will, or love of good; from heavenly influx into that we shall intuitively perceive the truth. This is the order of heaven. In this way we regain Eden and true knowledge. In this way we enter and live in heaven. Thus, only the good truly know; only the good are truly wise.

WALTER B. MURRAY.

A PARTIAL STUDY OF A LOST ARCANUM.*

IN a work prematurely published, entitled "To the Law and to the Testimony," it was amongst other things indicated that in Swedenborg's profound treatise on "Conjugal Love," the terms *vir* and *femina* did not mean, and should not be understood as meaning a human male person, or man, and a human female person, or woman, but that they were spiritual entities or beings, the *vir* being the faculty of the understanding in man (*homo*), and the *femina* being the faculty of the will, and that these two faculties constituted and made man (*homo*), and also an angel. It was also indicated in that book that this conclusion had been slowly reached, from a consideration of the statements made in that one work of Swedenborg, and then was only reached from a partial study of the first part of the book, which was not contemplated when the writer's work was undertaken.

As it was likewise pointed out, that Swedenborg in "Conjugal Love," n. 156², had in so many words stated "that spiritual things were meant which from two (*duobus*) made one man (*unum hominem*)," this statement should have been received. Perhaps also the writer should have more faithfully done what he has urged upon his readers, viz.: heeded Swedenborg's references to other places where he explains his meaning. In n. 127 he had in the strongest language he could use told us that unless a knowledge of correspondence had preceded, and fully revealed (*detecta*), was actually domiciled in the understanding, it would be utterly to no purpose to attempt to comprehend the subject he was treating of, and he thereupon proceeded to tell us that if we wanted to understand the subject of Correspondence, we could find the instruction generally in the "Apoc-

*Read in connection with this article, an editorial with the same title in this number of the REVIEW.

alypse Revealed" and the "Arcana Cœlestia," specifically in "The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Sacred Scripture," and particularly in a memorable relation following.

Readers will recall a great many equally strong statements by Swedenborg, that unless the "Doctrine of Degrees" is fully understood, it would likewise be impossible to understand the profound arcana he was revealing as to all spiritual truths. If the writer had done what was directed, he would have understood better, and would not have limited the signification of the term "man" (*homo*) to "mankind" or "the human race," but would have seen that by *homo* Swedenborg not only meant "man" in the three degrees, celestial, spiritual and natural, but also the internal man and the external man of all these degrees. In "Heaven and Hell," n. 33, we learn that there are three degrees of the interiors with every one, as well angel as spirit, and also with man (*hominem*). In n. 32 we learn of the internal and external man, the internal being the will and the external the understanding. Knowing that, he would have realized what he now sees clearly, that when Swedenborg spoke of the kinds (*genera*) and of the "degrees" (*gradus*) of adulteries in the chapter devoted to that subject in the work on "Conjugal Love" the three kinds were the adulteries of the celestial, the spiritual and the natural man (*homo*),* and the degrees were the two of *Fornicatio*, first that of the *adolescens* or "adulter of ignorance," second, that of the *juvenis*, who had the knowledge, but from stress of lust did not use it, i. e., the "adultery of lust," third, *pellicatus*, or "adultery of the reason," and fourth, *concubinatus*, or "adultery of the will."

*In "Conjugal Love," n. 482, the three kinds of adulteries are called spiritual, moral, and civil. But what is said about the interiors of man (*homo*) in "Heaven and Hell," n. 39, and especially what is said about the *Anima*, which is the mind of what is here designated the *celestial* man, indicates that the degree spoken of must be celestial. In "Divine Love and Wisdom," n. 260, Swedenborg speaks of the celestial mind, the spiritual mind, and the natural mind. Elsewhere these minds are respectively designated

As it is so absolutely necessary that Swedenborg's significatives should be understood, and as the most vital and fundamental of these are the *vir* and *femina*, the purpose of this article is to prove from his writings that these characters are spiritual and not material, and that all their activities are mental and not physical. The proof on this point is so abundant, that if all the material gathered by the writer in the shape of extracts from nearly all the writings were printed, it would fill not only all the pages of this number of the REVIEW, but of several numbers. Therefore the title of this article. The subject is so important

Anima, Mens and Animus. The mind in all the degrees consists of a Will, which is the internal, and an Understanding, which is external. The mind therefore in this sense is the man (*homo*). At the end of this (n. 260) Swedenborg writes "It is the same whether it is said the natural and spiritual man (*homo*), or the natural and spiritual mind (*mens*)." Comparatively little is said about the celestial mind, probably because of what is said in "Heaven and Hell," n. 39. After telling us that with every angel and with every man (*hominem*) there is an inmost or supreme degree, it is made plain that this cannot be fully described, for the passage continues: "or an inmost or supreme *something* (*quoddam*), into which the Divine of the Lord first or proximately inflows, from which it arranges in systematic order (*disponit*) the other interiors which go forth from below (*succedunt*), according to the degrees of order with them (*apud illos*)." The last two words the Rotch translators, apparently not understanding the matter, render, "in him." The passage continues: "The inmost or supreme can be called the entrance (*introitus*) of the Lord to the angel and to the man (*hominem*), and His veriest dwelling place (*ipsissimum Ipsius domicilium*) with them." We know little about this. Indeed in "Divine Love and Wisdom," n. 256, Swedenborg says of all this subject, "This, although it can with great difficulty (*aegre*) be comprehended by those who as yet are not in a knowledge of the degrees of altitude, nevertheless without ceasing or intermission it *must be revealed because it is of Angelic wisdom*." It is plain that Swedenborg did not expect much of what he revealed to be comprehended at once; and it certainly has not been, not only in "Conjugal Love," but in his other works also. But yet he as the chosen revelator of this angelic wisdom must reveal it, and the Church must search for his hidden meanings.

that a full and exhaustive study should be made, but the limitations of such an article compel that here and now it must, and could, be only partial. These limitations are not without their compensation. They compel every one really desiring to get at the truth, for the sake of truth, to study this subject fully and personally. That study will not have progressed far, if Swedenborg's words in the Latin are carefully analyzed, before the student will have realized that not only the work on "Conjugal Love," but all the books, must not only be carefully revised, but re-translated. This will involve a good deal of work, but no inherent difficulty. So soon as it will have been recognized that Swedenborg in all of his books states that we are not to understand by a particular word or phrase what that word or phrase would generally mean, and thereupon proceeds to assign the meaning he intends, all that is necessary is to make a careful glossary of his words with the signification attached to them, and substitute that signification for the words of the text, and if nothing else results, it will be found that there is not a single gross conception in any of his works, not even in the second part of *Conjugal Love*; he will not contradict himself in any particular, which the present translations imply that he does, and all of the statements now attributed to him which are either absurdly trite, or meaningless, will be found to be full of the most profound spiritual truth, and the most practical instruction. As many illustrations of these various things will be found in the citations which follow, pertaining to the subject of this article, only one illustration will be given here, of one of Swedenborg's propositions, which, and the elaboration of which as translated, will be seen to convey no rational idea.

The proposition elaborated by Swedenborg in "*Conjugal Love*," n. 432, is: "*Quod amor scortatorius plus et plus faciat hominem non hominem et virum non virum, et quod amor conjugalior faciat hominem plus et plus hominem et virum.*"

The new Library Edition of the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society renders this: "That scorta-

tory love more and more makes man not man (*homo*), and a man not a man (*vir*); and that conjugal love makes man more and more man (*homo*) and more and more a man (*vir*).” The Rotch Edition has it: “That scortatory love makes man not man (*homo*) more and more, and a man not a man (*vir*); and that marriage love makes man more and more man (*homo*) and a man (*vir*).”

✓The Academy gives the best of all the translations and from theirs some sense can be extracted. They translate: “That scortatory love more and more makes a human being not human, and a man not a man; and that conjugal love makes a human being more and more human, and a man.” (C. Th. Odhner’s “Laws of Order,” page 40.)

Assigning to the word “human” Swedenborg’s technical signification, a large part of the meaning of this proposition is given, yet not in a way to inform the ordinary reader. But what meaning will or can that reader extract from the other translations, and can it be believed that Swedenborg would write such meaningless stuff?

Now he has defined *homo*, and sometimes *homo* means mankind, or the human race; but not here. He has also defined *vir* alone, and in contrast with *homo*. He has also defined conjugal love. Let us take his definitions and insert them in the above proposition, and then see if it is meaningless. *Homo* has very many significations according to the context. In “Arcana Cœlestia,” n. 3134, he says that *vir* is often mentioned in the Word, as *vir et uxor*, *vir et femina*, and *vir et homo*. He says *vir* is the understanding and also truth. *Homo* is the whole man, the united will and understanding, but when used in contrast with *vir* it means the will (which he shows is essentially the man), and also good. Conjugal love is defined in hundreds of places, as good and truth indissolubly united. Scortatory love is its direct opposite, or the union of evil and falsity. For *homo* and *vir*, *amor conjugalis* and *amor scortatorius*, substitute these definitions, and the proposition reads: “That the union of evil and falsity more and more makes good not good, and truth not truth; and that

on the other hand good and truth conjoined makes good more and more good and truth.”*

Every New-Church reader of Swedenborg will recognize in the foregoing a very terse statement of truths which he has demonstrated over and over again,—any mingling of evil and falsity with good would make it not good, and good without truth is not real good, but good and truth united would not only tend to make good more good, but it would make it genuine good because truth would be conjoined, or in the language of the proposition—*hominem*, good, would be made good and truth (*hominem et virum*.)

THE LOST ARCANUM

In Genesis i, 27, we read: “So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.” In Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 53, 54. Swedenborg opens this passage of the Word and gives its internal or spiritual meaning. He writes:

And God created man (*hominem*) in His own image; in the image of God created He him. The word Image is twice used here, because Faith which is of the Understanding, is called His own image; but Love, which is of the Will, which in the Spiritual man (*homine*) follows, but in the Celestial man (*homine*) precedes, is called the Image of God. (n. 53.)

Masculum and *foeminam* created He them. What is meant in the internal sense by *Masculum* and *Foeminam* was most perfectly known to the Most Ancient Church, but with their posterity, when the interior sense of the Word was lost, this arcanum was also certainly lost. Their highest happinesses (*felicitates*)† and delights (*delitiae*)† were Marriages, and whatever could in any

*Is this a translation? Is it not an interpretation of doctrine rather? And if adopted would it not destroy what the writer himself calls the primary, or natural meaning?—EDITOR.

†*Felicitas* primarily signifies “fertility” or “fruitfulness.” Use must result, or good be produced to constitute real happiness. There is no such word in the lexicon as *delitiae*, but *deliciae* is a common word from a verb which primarily means “to entice from the right way.” Swedenborg undoubtedly assigns to this new word a special signification which the writer has not yet found in his own words.

way be so likened, they likened to Marriages, that thence they might perceive the happiness of Marriage; and because they were Internal men (*homines*), they were delighted only with internals. External things they viewed only with their eyes, but they thought about them as to what they represented, *so that externals were nothing to them*, only as something that enabled them to turn their thoughts from them to internals, and from internals to celestial, and thus to the Lord, who was all to them, and consequently to the Heavenly Marriage, from which they perceived the happiness of their Marriages to come. Therefore in the Spiritual Man (*homine*) the Understanding they called *Masculum*, and the Will *Foeminam*, which when they act as one, they called Marriage. From that Church came the form of speech, which became customary, that the Church Itself from affection for good, was called Daughter, then Virgin,—as the Virgin of Zion, the Virgin of Jerusalem, as well as Wife. (n. 54.)

If all that is involved in the foregoing could be taken into the mind, the arcanum would be understood. It will be noted that a number of words are capitalized. This is because the original words in the Latin are so capitalized. It is believed that the peculiar significance of this practice has not been noticed before, nor understood. From much observation it is inferred, that this capitalization, except in proper names and marks of Deity, is of words to which Swedenborg attaches a special signification, especially significatives. A moment's inspection will enable any of his students to see that to all of the words so designated above, he has assigned a meaning altogether apart from their etymology. Unfortunately, the modern Latin editors have taken away even this help to the student.

Despite the statement in the foregoing that the words *masculum* and *feminam* involve an arcanum that had been lost, and the subsequent explanation as to what those terms really mean, all the translators have rendered the statement "*Masculum* and *feminam* created He them," "MALE and FEMALE created He them." Is it an arcanum that mankind was created MALE and FEMALE? If it ever was, does history tell of a time when it was not known that man (*homo*) was so created? Is this information so vital to man's well-being, that Infinite Wisdom should find it neces-

sary to impart it in the Divine Word? But that man is created an understanding and a will is an arcanum that had been long lost is proved by the fact that Swedenborg's reverent translators had not yet understood it, notwithstanding the light of the "Second Coming," and notwithstanding the fact that here and in hundreds of places in all his books. Swedenborg had over and over again reiterated the statement, that man (*homo*) was created a will and an understanding; that man had two faculties, a will and an understanding; that these two faculties constituted man, and also the angel; that the understanding and the will together constituted the mind (*mens*), and that the mind was the man himself. It makes no difference whether you are reading in the "Arcana," the "Apocalypse Revealed" or "Explained," the "Divine Love and Wisdom," the "Divine Providence," "Heaven and Hell," "The Four Doctrines," "The New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine," or in the last work of all, the "True Christian Religion," the observant student cannot but marvel at the constant iteration of the above and similar statements, all to the effect that God created man (*homo*) an understanding and a will, and this because THE MAN, THE ONLY MAN, (*Solus Homo*, see *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 768), the Lord Himself, who Himself not only told Pilate, but every one in all ages that He was THE MAN, when He said "*Ecce Homo*," because this MAN was Divine Love and Divine Wisdom, and when He created man (*homo*) in His image and likeness, He created man an understanding and will, that these essentially human faculties might be receptacles of truth and good from Him.

Careless readers complain that Swedenborg is verbose, and repeats himself; but the reverent and understanding student knows that he never uses a redundant word, and that he has Divine authority as to the necessity of repeating the most important instruction, "For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little" (Isaiah xxviii, 10). Is it not proof, that this wonderful reiteration of the meaning of this lost arcanum was necessary, when in this year 1913,

one hundred and forty-one years after Swedenborg had rested from his labors, many of his disciples cannot accept his teachings about the *masculus* and *femina*, or *vir* and *femina*, and still believe that the Lord in His Word revealed that man (*homo*) was created *male* and *female*, and that His servant, in the opening of the Word, taught the same thing, and even more tritely taught, that "male" was "masculine," and "female" was "feminine"? for that is what he is translated as teaching in "Conjugal Love," n. 32. We read: "And man (*homo*) is *masculus* and *femina*, and the one (*masculus*) is masculine, and the other (*femina*) is feminine."

In the above quotation from "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 54, it is stated that the internal men of the Most Ancient Church when they viewed these external things (in this case the words *masculum* and *feminam*), thought only about what they represented, so that to them *externals were nothing*. Was this fact so carefully stated by Swedenborg, merely as a curious historical fact, or was it for the purpose of teaching us what we should do? Does he not by this statement say to us, that we are to regard as nothing the external signification of *masculus* and *femina*, and we are to think of what those terms represent, namely, the understanding and the will, and that the truth we are to learn is that man (*homo*) was created an understanding and a will? Have we understood this arcanum, now that it has been revealed to us by the Lord, or are we to be and remain of that posterity with whom this arcanum is lost?

It might perhaps be said, that the foregoing is an isolated passage, perhaps not fully understood and lacking confirmation. To dispel this idea, let us consider more briefly some other passages. In the King James Bible, in Genesis v. 2, we read, "Male and female created He them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam." In "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 475, Swedenborg translates these words: *Masculum* and *feminam* created He them, and blessed them, and called their name *Homo*." In n. 476, opening the spiritual meaning of these words we read: "That by *masculum* and *femi-*

nam is signified the marriage between faith and love, has been said and shown before, viz: that "*Masculus* or *Vir* [remember this *or*] signifies the Understanding, and what things are of the Understanding, thus what are of faith, and that *femina* signifies the Will, or what are of the Will, thus what are of love; wherefore she (the *femina*) was called Eve, from life, which is of love alone." Then speaking of their subsequent state, when the marriage between the *masculus et femina* has been effected, he writes: "*Masculus* and *femina* is not said, but Man (*homo*), which by reason of the marriage signifies both; wherefore it immediately follows, and He called their name Man (*homo*)."
In the very next number we read; "for in the highest sense, the Lord Himself alone is Man (*Homo*)."
This being so, is it not almost irreverent for Swedenborg's translators to render the word *homo*, "a man," and "he," as they all, and so often, do?

These words as found in Genesis, and as quoted by our Lord in Matthew and Mark, are explained in many other passages in the writings of Swedenborg; but perhaps it will be sufficient for the present purpose, to refer only to "Apocalypse Explained," n. 725, where a number of passages from the Word are collected and explained. It perhaps should be remembered, that these passages are also explained in "Conjugal Love," n. 156, but not so plainly, because of the particular use of that book, teaching the same truth, but in a way better adapted to the extremely gross and natural men to whom it is outwardly addressed.

The first case cited in this number is that of the "man child" born to the woman clothed with the sun. (Revelation xii, 5.) Swedenborg translates "man child," *filius masculus*, i. e. "a son *masculus*." To be consistent, the Rotch and other translators render this "a male child." It was probably realized that "a male son" would be tautological at least, and so, in spite of all Swedenborg says about the *masculus*, among other things that it is "masculine," being persuaded that *masculus* was an adjective and meant "male," they pervert the plain meaning of *filius* "son" and

write "child," so that their statement should not be ridiculous. This is an example of many absolute mistranslations, induced by the failure to grasp Swedenborg's meaning, and making it necessary to change what he had written to comport with their idea of what he meant, and to import into the whole statement some sense. If they had only taken the pains to find out what Swedenborg meant by *masculus*, they would not have found it necessary to mangle his text. If they had only turned to this same passage in "Apocalypse Revealed," they would have seen that *filius* "son," could not be translated "child" without destroying the spiritual sense, and they would also have learned the profound signification of *filium masculum*. We read in that work:

"And she bore a son *masculus*," signifies the Doctrine of the New Church. By "son" (*filium*) in the Word is signified the truth of Doctrine, then the Understanding, and thence thought of truth and good, but by "daughter" (*filiam*) is signified the good of doctrine, then the Will, and thence affection of truth and good; and by the *filium masculum* is signified truth conceived in the spiritual man (*homine*) and born in the natural man. (n. 543.)

This is what Swedenborg writes, and noting the care with which he makes the distinction between *filius*, son, and *filia*, daughter, can *filium* in the expression *filium masculum* mean "child," or is it not necessarily "son," and if so, can *masculus* mean "male"? If they had made this proper comparison when they perceived their difficulty in translating Swedenborg's text, they would have found, as the writer did only at this point, the distinction made by our author between the terms *masculus* and *vir*. There had been seen the expressions *vir seu masculus*, or as our author so often says, "what is the same," *vir aut masculus*, the conjunctions *seu* and *aut*, both meaning OR, and thus *vir* and *masculus* being used almost synonymously, and it had also been seen that they both functionated similarly, and yet, while the writer was sure that Swedenborg made some distinction between these terms, or different ones would not have been used, it was long before the distinction could be seen, and now he is perfectly convinced that Swedenborg

did not expect or intend that this and many other distinctions would and should be seen by the superficial reader, otherwise the primary use of what he had written would be lost, and even the natural teaching rejected; yet, as this was Divine truth, revealed from heaven, it must be stated, so as to be seen when the world was ready for it and could receive and be benefited by it. The following is the distinction between these terms here indicated. The *vir* and the *masculus* both signify the truth and also the understanding of man (*homo*); but the *masculus* is the truth in and the understanding brought down into, or as said, "born" in, the natural man. They are both similar and corresponding faculties of men (*hominum*), but of men of different "degrees" or planes. There is a like distinction between the *femina* conjoined to the *vir* and that conjoined to the *masculus*. They are both the will or good, but one is of the spiritual degree and on that plane, and the other of the natural degree and on that plane.

The other cases cited in *Apocalypse Explained*, n. 725, must be treated more briefly, only the explanations of *masculum* and *feminam* being given, but the readers are earnestly requested not only in this, but in all the extracts cited, to turn to their books and read all that is written. In the second case, Genesis i, 27, and v. 2, explained in the above extracts from the "*Arcana Cœlestia*," are further explained. First let it be noted, however, that Swedenborg before beginning his explanation, says what he so frequently does, and in the strongest and most impressive language, that it is utterly impossible to know or understand the arcana involved in these passages from the Word, unless from their spiritual sense. In other words, if by *masculum* and *feminam* the reader sees and understands nothing more than "male and female," he or she is in as hopeless case as the other posterity of the Most Ancient Church, who having lost the internal sense of the Word, have also lost the capacity to understand this Divine and significant arcanum, so necessary to know in order to derive the benefits of this Divine instruction. We read:

Thence it is plain that by man (*Homine*) who is called "Adam and Eve," is understood that [the Most Ancient] church; for it is said, *Masculum* and *Feminam* created He them, and called their name Man (*Homo*); and because by both was understood that church, it follows that by *masculum* is understood its TRUTH, and by *feminam* its GOOD; so also by *masculum* doctrine, and by *feminam* life; since the doctrine of truth is also the doctrine of love and charity, thus the doctrine of life, and a life of good is also a life of love and charity, thus a life of doctrine, that is, a life according to doctrine. These two are understood by *masculum et feminam*, and taken together and also conjoined [see Swedenborg's definition of *conjunctio* and *conjugium* in the following extracts from *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 665-6] in marriage, are called Man (*Homo*), and also form the church, which as said above is meant by Man (*Homo*) * * * That these two, viz: doctrine and life, taken together and as if conjoined in marriage, are called Man (*Homo*) from the understanding of truth and from the will of good.

Considering what is thus written, did Swedenborg teach, and did he expect us to understand and say, that *masculus* and *femina* meant "male" and "female"?

The third case cited in *Apocalypse Explained*, n. 725, is the spiritual explication of Matthew xix, 4-6, and Mark x, 6-8, all of which is highly instructive and strongly confirmatory of what is here written. Confining this citation to the meaning of "male and female" in Matthew, "Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning male and female," and in Mark, "But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female," Swedenborg begins by saying that as with every other particular of the Word, these words *must be understood* spiritually, and then continues:

And if not (understood) spiritually, *no one can know* what *masculus* and *femina* signifies, etc. * * * by *masculum* and *feminam* in the spiritual sense is signified here, as above, truth and good; hence also the doctrine of truth, which is the doctrine of life, and a life of truth which is a life of doctrine; these will not be two, but one, since truth is not truth with man (*hominem*) without the good of life, nor does good become good with any-one without the truth of doctrine; for good does not become spiritual good except by truths, and also spiritual good is good,

but not natural good without that (spiritual good); when those are one, then truth is of good, and good is of truth; this one is understood by "one flesh." * * * From these things also it can be established that by *filium masculum* is signified the doctrine of love and charity, thence the doctrine of life.

The fourth case commences:

Since truth of doctrine or doctrine of truth is signified by *masculum*, therefore the law was given "That every *masculum* opening the womb, should be holy to Jehovah," (Exodus xiii, 12, 15; Deuteronomy xv, 19; Luke ii, 23), for from the marriage of truth and good, which in the spiritual sense is understood by the marriage of the understanding and the will (*vir et mulieris*), as is said above, truths and goods are born, which thence in that sense, are signified by "sons and daughters" (*filios et filias*), truths by "sons" and goods by "daughters."

The whole of this case is very instructive and should be read, but it is plain from this last case that *masculum* cannot be an adjective, and the translators have seen this. Why should they in this same number so often render the noun *masculum* by the adjective "male"?

There are a number of other passages from the Word explained in this n. 725, where the word "male," or "a male," is rendered by Swedenborg by the term *masculus*, to which in every instance he assigns the above signification, or its opposite, "falsity," or "falsity of doctrine," but reference will be made to only one more passage where a part of Ezekiel xvi, 17, is explained, because it is so plain that the word *masculus* does not mean "a male," that even the translators of the Bible have not so translated it, the Authorized Version being, "And madest to thyself images of men, and didst commit whoredom with them." There is a note after the words "of men," telling us that in the Hebrew the words are "of a male," the same Hebrew word found in the above passages cited from the Old Testament, and rendered "male," and for which Swedenborg always uses the term *masculus*. The Biblical translators saw that the expression "a male" would be meaningless, for it might be a male of birds or beasts, and so they say "of men." Of course these translators did not understand the technical

signification of the verb they have translated "didst commit whoredom," and as the verb did not mean "commit adultery," or rather was not the verb used in the Commandment, and so they render it by the above general expression, which has no precise or specific meaning. Swedenborg's translators, overlooking what he says about the meaning of *masculus*, and the technical signification he gives to the verb *scortor*, translate *masculi* "of a male," and the above verb as do those who translated the Bible. Swedenborg translates this passage "And thou madest to thyself images of a *masculus*, with which thou didst scortate." He explains "images *masculi* (i. e. of a *masculus*) are appearances of truth, and nevertheless false, and to scortate is to falsify." In *Arcana Coelestia*, n. 8904, we read: *Imagines Masculi*, signify appearances and similitudes of truth." This is what Swedenborg says, and some precise meaning can be gathered from his statement; but what rational idea can one who only reads the English translation gather from the following collection of words, "And madest for thee images of a male, with which thou couldst commit whoredom"? What precise meaning does that last word have, and is it possible to conceive of Swedenborg using an expression which does not have a definite meaning? Every New Churchman understands the difference between falsifying truths and adulterating goods, and Swedenborg is at great pains to tell us that in the Word, the verb that is used to signify to falsify truths, is *scortor*. Why should not his readers have the benefit of this information, and what is the use of his being so explicit when the English reader is only told that to scortate means to commit whoredom—as to the exact meaning of which expression no two readers could agree, and no one could transpose it into intelligible terms.

This arcanum of the *masculus* and *femina*, or what is the same, only in a higher degree, or on a higher plane, the *vir* and *uxor*, is further explained in Genesis vi and vii, in the former chapter where the Lord directed Noah as to what was to be taken into the ark, and in the latter what

did enter the ark; that is, that they might be regenerated and saved.

As has been pointed out, Swedenborg had said in "Conjugal Love" that what was there treated of could not by any possibility be grasped by the mind, or understood, unless a knowledge of correspondences had preceded, and he then told where that knowledge could be obtained, namely: in the "Arcana" and other books. Perhaps if his translators had heeded this advice, they would have been enabled to make a translation that would have contained the truth he was revealing. The writer found it utterly impossible to gather from the work on "Conjugal Love" the real force and meaning of many of Swedenborg's terms. He could only see that they did not mean what the translators said. A partial and necessarily incomplete study of the other books has removed many of these difficulties, and he is firmly convinced that a complete study by one who is only seeking the truth for its own sake, will make everything clear and plain, but this will be a work of many years, and should be by many minds. It may be a help and encouragement to others to point out how many definitions and explanations were found when the writer studied the sixth chapter of Genesis, to see what Swedenborg meant by *masculum* and *feminam* there. Space forbids but a reference to this, but in general let it be said, that if the sixth and seventh chapters of Genesis are studied in the "Arcana," and especially what precedes and follows those chapters, a good rational conception can be formed of the three heavens in man, and of their opposites, and it will be seen that this instruction is intensely practical and personal, for it does not mainly refer to conditions or states to be experienced only after death, but is vital in explaining how the heaven (*coelum*) in each of our three minds can be opened, and especially how what is loved and thought there can be brought down to, and loved and thought on, the earth (*in terra*) of the external man, or, what is the same, the external mind on each plane; and we will understand what is involved in that part of the Lord's prayer, where we pray

"Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, as in HEAVEN so upon the EARTH, (*sicut in COELO etiam in TERRA*).” Note Swedenborg’s capitalization of *Coelo* and *Terra*!

In the “Arcana,” nn. 665, 666, amongst many others, we find the following terse and cogent statements and definitions,

1. No other COVENANT (*foedus*) can exist between the Lord and man (*hominem*), than CONJUNCTION by love and faith.
2. A covenant (*foedus*) is or means a conjunction by love and faith.
3. Conjunction means this *foedus*, or conjunction by love and faith.
4. This covenant (*foedus*) is the heavenly marriage (*conjugium coeleste*.)
5. The heavenly marriage (*conjugium coeleste*), is the very covenant itself (*ipsissimum foedus*).
6. The heavenly marriage (*conjugium coeleste*), is conjunction.
7. Regeneration in its widest sense is the covenant (*foedus*).
8. The Lord enters into a covenant (*foedus*) with man when He regenerates him.
9. Among the ancients the covenant (*foedus*) represented nothing else than regeneration.
10. That the covenant (*foedus*) signifies nothing else than regeneration, and what are of regeneration.
11. That the Lord Himself is called the Covenant (*Foedus*) in the Word, because He alone it is Who regenerates, and who is looked to by the regenerate man (*homine*) and is the All in All of love and faith.
12. Since the Lord is the very Covenant Itself (*Ipsum Foedus*), it is evident that all which conjoins man (*hominem*) to the Lord is of the Covenant (*Foedus*), thus love and faith and those things which are of love and faith; for these are of the Lord, and the Lord is in them; and thus the Covenant Itself (*Ipsum Foedus*) is in them, where they are received. These are bestowed upon the regenerate only, with whom whatever is of regeneration is of the Lord, that is of the Covenant (*Foedus*), or is the Covenant (*Foedus*).

Suppose we took into our minds only one of these ideas, that as to the signification of the heavenly marriage, how marvellous would be the change in our conceptions of what Swedenborg teaches. When we realized that the heavenly

marriage was a purely spiritual conception, involving the spiritual union of truth and good, or faith and love, or the understanding and the will, then we would also know, that the opposites of this marriage would not be the disorderly sexual relations of human beings, but rather the disorderly *connubia* of falsity and evil.*

Taking one single example, if in "Conjugal Love," n. 460, that number which as translated shocks the moral sense of even that church which has no perception of other than the literal sense of the Commandments, and which so offends our own women that they demand that the book be suppressed or expurgated, for the "Covenant" therein spoken of, we should understand the Covenant or *Foedus* as explained by Swedenborg, and if by the "virgin" we understood an "affection for truth" which has not yet been conjoined to the "truth," or *vir*, for which the affection was inborn or given by the Lord, how purely spiritual would the conception be, and how completely would every idea that was gross and offensive be eliminated, and how clearly would we see that in accordance with the laws of the heavenly marriage, if the virgin and the *vir* were united in conjugal love, the *vir* could not by any law (*ex aliquo jure*) withdraw (*recedere*) from the *conjunction*, (this last word being also understood as above), without profaning (*violatione*) that conjunction or conjugal union.

In the "Arcana Coelestia," n. 669, rendering into Latin the last part of Genesis vi, 19, "they shall be male and female," he writes "*masculus et femina erunt*," and explaining these terms he writes: "*Masculus* is truth, *foemina* is good."

In Genesis vii, 2, we read: "Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens [the Hebrew has it seven seven], the male and his female: and of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and his female." It is one of the wonderful confirmations of the truth of the internal sense

*Swedenborg teaches that the disorderly relations of human beings have their causes by correspondence in the *connubia* of falsity and evil in the hells.—EDITOR.

that it can be found only in the correct text, and that it is destroyed if anything is added to or subtracted from the text. Swedenborg in the "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 713, translates the above: "Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee, seven, seven, the *virum* and his *uxorem*, and of beasts that are not clean thou shalt take two, the *virum* and his *uxorem*." His translators make him say: "Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee seven, seven, the man and his wife; [one edition has it 'the husband and his wife']; and of the beast that is not clean, two, the man and his wife." Can the reader of the translation get any rational idea from the foregoing? What man is spoken of, *homo* or *vir*? Did the translator who rendered *virum* "husband" fail to see what a holy signification attaches to *maritus*, "husband"? The Lord alone is called THE Husband. Was it overlooked that two lines after the above Swedenborg writes, "by *virum* and *uxorem* is signified that truths are conjoined to goods," and this because in this case by "seven" are signified what are holy, in contradistinction to "two" which signifies what is respectively profane, and therefore in that case he writes, "by *virum* and *uxorem* [are signified] falses conjoined to evils."

If what Swedenborg immediately added in n. 713 was overlooked, should it not have been seen that in n. 717, speaking of the explanation he had given of the above and similar passages of the Word he writes: "From these things also it is evident that what is here treated of is concerning the voluntary things of man (*hominis*), or concerning his good and holy things, which are predicated, of the will"? But what follows in n. 718 should certainly have prevented his translators from speaking of "the man and his wife," or "the husband and his wife," when speaking of animals. The Biblical translators, without illumination from the light of "the Second Coming," have not so violated the dictates of common sense.

We read:

That by *virum* and *uxorem* are signified that truths are conjoined to goods is evident from the signification of *Viri*, that it is

truth which is of the understanding, and from the signification of *uxoris*, that it is *good* which is of the will, concerning which, before; and accordingly, that with man (*homine*) there exists neither the least of thought, nor the least of affection, and of action, in which there is not a certain marriage of the understanding and of the will, and without a certain marriage not anything exists or is produced. In the very organic forms of man (*hominis*) composite and simple, yea the most simple, is a passive and an active, which, if they should not be united as in marriage like that of truth and good (*instar viri et uxoris*), could not in any way be there, or still less produce anything; in universal nature it is similar; these perpetual marriages derive their principle and origin from the heavenly marriage. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 718.)

In n. 721 we read, "That by *virum* and *uxorem* are signified falses conjoined to evils." In n. 722, "by *masculum* and *foeminam* are signified truths and goods." In n. 725, That by "*masculum* and *foeminam* are signified truths and goods can be evident from those things which have been said and shown before that *vir* and *masculus* signify truth, *uxor* and *foemina* good; but *masculus* and *foemina* is predicated of intellectual things, but *vir* and *uxor* of voluntary things, from the reason, that by *virum* and *uxorem* is represented marriage, not so (*non ita*) by *masculum* and *foeminam*." The Rotch translators apparently not understanding this teaching, and evidently believing there was a sort of marriage between *masculum* and *foeminam*, translate *non ita* "and not so much." Swedenborg continues, and what he says here and elsewhere should have explained what he wrote, and prevented this unwarranted perversion of his statements: "For truth can never from (or of) itself initiate (*inire*) marriage with good, but good can with truth; because nowhere exists some truth which is not brought forth (or begotten) by good, and in such manner is united to good; if you abstract good from truth, nothing whatever remains but thoughts without affection (and so without life, *voces*)."

In Swedenborg's vocabulary, *masculum* means truth or the understanding, and *femina* good or the will, but neither

one is united to the other. There has as yet been no marriage of the two, constituting them one. *Vir* also means truth or the understanding, and *uxor* good or the will, but the *uxor* is the wife of that particular *vir*, and they are consequently both married. It is further taught that when the union is effected, the will has acted and caused this. In the case of *masculus* and *femina*, the *femina* is not a wife, is not married to the *masculus*, the will has not acted and effected the union, and therefore it is said that *masculus* and *femina* are predicated of intellectual things, and *vir* and *uxor* of voluntary things. Swedenborg does not say that the *masculus* and *femina* are "not so much" married as the *vir* and *uxor*, but that they are not married at all.

Speaking of the birds that went into the ark in pairs, male and female, in verse 9, Swedenborg again says *masculus* and *femina*, and in "Arcana Coelestia," n. 743, writes "*masculus* and *femina*" signify, as before, truth and good. In n. 745 he calls attention to the distinction between "fowls of the heavens" and simply "fowl." They all signify thoughts, but the "fowls of the heavens (his technical or spiritual *coelum*) signify rational thoughts which are of the internal man (*homo*) who dwells in heaven (*in coelo*), and the others are the thoughts of the external man (*homo*) who dwells on the earth (*in terra*). In n. 749 he again calls attention to the distinction between *masculus* and *femina*, and *vir* and *femina*. He writes:

That *masculus* and *femina* signify truth and good is evident from those things which (are said) before (Chapter vi, 19); where *masculus* and *femina* is predicated of birds (fowl) but *vir* and *uxor* of beasts; the reason was also stated there, namely: that there is a marriage of things of the will with those of the understanding, and *not so* (*non ita*) of things of the understanding regarded in themselves with things of the will. The former are related as *vir* and *uxor*, but the latter in fact as *masculus* and *femina*; and because here as already stated it is first treated of the temptation of that man (*homo*) as to his intellectuals [or things of his understanding], it is said *masculus* and *femina*; and combat or temptation as to things of the understanding is meant.

In this number the Rotch translators again render (*non*

ita) "not so much." None of the lexicons warrant this, or give such a meaning to *ita*. If Swedenborg had intended to say "not so much," he would have written *non tantum*, as he so often does. Having never understood this arcanum, and remaining in the same idea about it that the posterity of the Ancient Church had, they "correct" Swedenborg so as to make him conform to their ideas.

There is only one more verse that needs to be considered, and this confirms all that has gone before, and adds some particulars, and finally explains the reason why the *masculus* and *femina*, the understanding and will, are not married, and do not act as one until after regeneration. In Genesis vii 16, we read: "And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him, and the Lord shut him in." For some reason the Rotch translators have followed the Bible rather than Swedenborg in almost all respects besides using the terms "male" and "female," in translating Swedenborg's Latin, which literally translated, reads as follows: "And they entering, *masculus* and *femina* of all flesh entered, in what manner God had commanded him; and Jehovah closed after that man."

Explaining this, Swedenborg writes:

Those entering signify the things which were with the man (*hominem*) of the Church; *masculus* and *femina* of all flesh entered, signify that truths and goods of every kind were with him; * * * and Jehovah closed after that man, signifies that man (*homo*) no longer had communication with heaven (*coelo*) of such quality as the man (*homo*) of the celestial church. (n. 781.)

It has been supposed and taught from this and similar passages that the men of the Most Ancient Church, or celestial men had open communication with all the heavens, probably such as Swedenborg had. There is no warrant for any such belief,* and the error has all arisen from misunderstanding Swedenborg's word *coelum*. When he spoke

*Nevertheless, Swedenborg teaches clearly and definitely that the men of the Most Ancient Church, talked with the angels of their heaven "as with their friends" (Heaven and Hell, n. 252 and elsewhere).—EDITOR.

of heaven, it seems to have been thought that he used this word with the same general signification as an old churchman, and meant the universal heavens. On the contrary, when he writes the word *Coelum*, and capitalizes it, the heaven he is speaking of is the heaven of the internal man in all three degrees, the celestial, spiritual and natural, those heavens in which the Lord dwells with every man, so that we all pray "Our Father who art in the heavens." In the days of the celestial man, the internal and the external man acted as one, as did also the understanding and will of the external and internal man of men of all three degrees. When that church came to an end, man (*homo*) could only be saved by the process indicated by building and entering the ark, by those and the things mentioned in the Divine story in part explained above. But the will of the man of that church at the time of entering the ark was so corrupt, and would so certainly have carried away the understanding into every evil and falsity, that it became necessary for the Lord to do what is meant by, "And Jehovah closed after that man." The door was shut between the internal and external man, and the marriage union between the understanding and will was severed, and thereafter they acted separately, and will continue to act separately, until the understanding by means of the truths, intelligence, and wisdom that it has been created with an affection and ability for acquiring, has with the Lord's constant help regenerated the will of the natural man and formed a new will and understanding, when the door will be opened, and communication established with the heaven (*coelo*) of the internal man.

The Treatise on "Conjugal Love" explains how all this may be done; how man can learn to know his evils that he may shun them. For his encouragement it is pointed out to him, that this process is a gradual one, and progresses by distinct steps, and that if his gaze is constantly fixed upon the heavenly goal, if above all things he desires and looks to conjugal love, by which is meant the Heavenly Marriage of good and truth, and will and understanding, he may, if he implores the Lord's help, safely stay for a time in a lower

state, while doing the work that will bring him into the next higher state. The *vir*, the understanding, is borne with and constantly encouraged to do its part, because otherwise there is no hope, and if the *vir* deserts the *uxor*, the new will that is being formed, that will necessarily become more evil, and the heavenly marriage provided and intended by the Lord utterly prevented and destroyed. All these spiritual processes and activities of the understanding and the will, with infinite and precise detail, are what are meant by the various activities of the *vir* and *femina* in Swedenborg's wonderful book, and not outward physical acts of human men and women, either good or bad. It is shown that there is a correspondence between the heavenly marriage and human marriages, but the latter can only become happy and perfected, as the heavenly marriage is effected, and therefore the practical instruction is to show us how to learn and put away the falsities and evils that prevent that marriage, in order that the human relations can be orderly and blessed.

The writer has collected a large number of passages from all the Writings, confirming and illustrating the foregoing, but realizes that to cite them all, would take too much space for an article in the REVIEW.*

THE WRITER'S POSITION.

In view of the criticism made by the Council of Ministers at the last Convention, that the writer in "To the Law and to the Testimony," had advanced an idea of a spiritual interpretation of "Conjugal Love," "which none will accept in the form in which he advances it," etc. (see *Messenger*

*The above is more than the first third of the article as offered by its author. Since the editors believe it adequately sets forth his view, and since the remainder consists of similar quotations from the writings of Swedenborg which show the meaning of significatives in the internal sense of the Word, and which are used by our author in a similar way to confirm the claim that they equally apply to Swedenborg's own works, the editors have not been able to give further space to them. But for obvious reasons an exception has been made of the following.—EDITOR.

of June 18, 1913), which idea the writer thinks should not have obtained, in view of what is written on p. xlv. of the preface to the above work under the caption "By the Double Sense in this Book is not Meant an Internal Sense, such as is in the Word," and in view also of the kindly advice given to him by one of the editors of the "REVIEW," that he should make clear in this article that he does not believe or suggest that Swedenborg's Writings, whether in "Conjugal Love" or elsewhere, have an internal sense like that of the Word, instead of reiterating his position in words of his own choosing, he quotes something that Swedenborg has written in explaining the above story of Reuben and the mandrakes.

After saying that "what mandrakes were, the translators did not know," and "that among the Ancients, who were of the church, all fruits and flowers were *significatives*," and after quoting from the Canticles what is there written about the mandrakes or dudaim, he writes:

As concerns that book in which is that which is called the Song of Songs, it is not among those which are called Moses and the Prophets, because it contains no internal sense, but is written in the Ancient style, full of *significatives* gathered from the books of the Ancient Church, and very many things which in the Ancient Church signified heavenly and spiritual love, especially (or chiefly) conjugal love; that it is such a book, is plain from this, that in the literal sense, and also inferior to (or differing from *secus*) those books which are called Moses and the Prophets, there stand out (or are visible, *exstent*) many things which are unbecoming (or indecent, *indecentia*.)

Swedenborg's writing is in many respects like this. It has no internal sense, but is full of *significatives*, the meaning of which he has been careful to give, but which have been overlooked by the translators, who have set down only the literal or etymological signification, instead of the real meanings specifically given to them. To intensify what Swedenborg so often says, *patet etiam ex eo*, it is also (unfortunately too) plain, that the failure to observe the real meanings of the *significatives vir* and *femina* in the

work on "Conjugal Love," and giving them only their literal sense, have caused to stand out many things which are *indecentia* in the worst meaning of that word; as for instance, what so appears to be taught about pellicacy and concubinage. The literal sense doubtless performed a great use, as did the letter of the Word, when for ages, nothing better could have been received. There is no possible question that pellicacy and concubinage are much less evil and destructive to the individual and society, than unrestrained indulgence; but because from the *significatives* used, this was all the instruction that first appeared, let no disciple of Swedenborg dare to say that this was all that he taught. When he simply stated that *they both were evils* he had said enough to tell every New Churchman, that they both must be absolutely shunned and put out of the life.

WILLIAM McGEORGE, JR.

THE WORD AS A WHOLE:

II. THE ISRAELITISH AGE.

THE term "Israelitish" in a strict sense designates that part of the Semitic life and history extending from the time of Abraham to the end of the reign of Solomon. Chronologies reckon it from the seventeenth to the tenth centuries B. C. The historical transactions and events of this period are narrated in the Biblical books of the Mosiac record from Exodus throughout; in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and eleven chapters of the first book of Kings.

In the following series the salient events of this history might be summarized thus: these books present:

1. The narrative of the Exodus from Egypt, ending with "the Song of Triumph" (Exodus i-xv).
2. The wilderness journeys, filled with the giving of a series of laws, covering all sorts of human relationship in body, mind, and spirit (Exodus xvi-end of Deuteronomy).
3. Preparation for, and final securing to, the Israelitish people a permanent abode, with the allotment of land as the foundation of civic construction (The book of Joshua).
4. Internal construction work, its difficulties and sporadic success (The book of Judges).
5. Two rival methods for ensuring stable progression, of which royalty (the external) gains the superiority over the theocratic (the internal). The development under Saul and David culminates under Solomon, and brings the Israelitish Age to its completion and end. (The books of Samuel and the first book of Kings to chapter xi inclusive.)

This long stretch of time and eventful course of history shows us a nation in its making. From a set of kindred tribes, unconscious of any internal coherence or obligation, there develops gradually a mediumship by which the unformed mass first finds itself, then cooperates in the escape from an ignoble alien service, and, learning like soldiers to

obey a command, acquires the power of marching together and presenting to the outer world a united aspect.

It is no difficult task to follow the making of this Israelitish nation, and to see how the heterogeneous tribal material gradually is led (perhaps by the example of other nations) to become conscious of its strength and value in the valor and dignity of a king. This development it is the duty of the historian to trace, and to him it is left. We would merely, in passing, allude to the fact, that neither a purely civil aspect of the history of Israel nor a strictly ecclesiastical review of its theocratic progression affords a sufficient view to exhibit the mechanism or the energy that utilized its efficiency for the culmination attained in the end; the survey should embrace both simultaneously, and this we would follow in sketchy outline.

The historical aspect of a nation, where the course of events is regarded mainly in relation to that nation, is the narrower cycle in which its development is usually traced from a certain beginning to a culmination, and finally an end. There is however a larger cycle in which historical units become links in a chain. In such a view the various elements of Hebrew, Israelitish, and Jewish periods appear as the whole Semitic series, which is the forerunner of a Greek and a succeeding Roman Age. In such larger view history becomes linked together, and we can obtain a glimpse of that larger outlook which embraces humanity as a whole. In this larger view the links of the chain assume a psychological nature, and one nation or race is seen as an aid to further development, such as is found in adjacent races and succeeding times.

In this respect the Semitic race appears as a race under direct and continuous guidance by a Superior Hand. The Greek and Roman nations show the clear differentiation of a race guiding itself as of itself. The succeeding races (embracing essentially races of the Christian realm, or at least the Indo-European type) present the race in the effort of guiding itself as of itself, under the effort of acknowledging that self-guidance as in a general way subject to a

plan. In our age there is, in the best mode of thought, the further effort of recognizing that plan definitely as a *Divine* plan.

This view makes it possible to see the larger cycle as a parallel, or an expansion of a smaller, individual cycle. That is to say, there is an age in the individual human life in which the individual is under a constant guidance. That age is succeeded by a self-guidance, which self-guidance is itself succeeded by a self-guidance under the recognition of the Divine guidance. We recognize these psychological steps as the period of instruction, followed in a general way by the age of responsibility, whether responsibility to civil authority or responsibility to civil authority under a Divine authority.

The Semitic Age is therefore to the human race what the age of instruction is to the individual life. The Abraham—or Hebrew—Age is the beginning of a so to speak systematic instruction. The Israelitish age is the age of coöperation in which the instructed enters into a mode of self-activity, which self-activity in the Jewish Age becomes more and more complete.

The endeavor of this paper is to enter in brief manner this psychological aspect of the Israelitish age, the age of the coöperation by the instructed with the instructor. This age presupposes the primary instruction, where the subject as to personality is passive. The awakening of the self-activity, is in those faculties where under the general attainment of intelligence that differentiation takes place in which intelligence becomes definite.

In the Israelitish age this definition of intelligence is saliently projected in the names of the books that portray them; Moses, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings—the respective form of leadership, prevailing successively.

The meaning of the leadership becomes evident when we carry out further the analogy of larger and smaller types. That is, the leader of an age becomes the type of a leading principle in a psychological development. In this aspect Moses, the giver of the law, becomes the faculty of recog-

nizing and formulating laws, while Joshua is the faculty of accommodating to laws. The Judges, presenting the story of applying the law to the affairs within the realm, become the faculty of judging or formulating a judgment. The story of Samuel, an apparent return to the theocratic regime, or the direct leading by authority, is the recognition of an element in law and judgment which is too frequently lost sight of—it is the fact that all formulation of law, and conformity to law in judgment, reach into, and are connected with, what is transcendental. (Not to enter into too much detail, it may perhaps be needful to call to mind, that the formulation of a law is the summing up of a series of known events in which is included a series of unknown events, which make up the universality of that series. Everything universal is in its nature infinite and hence every law is properly the connection of the finite with the infinite—whether that infinite be vague or otherwise. Judgment, or the conformance to law, is bound to this universality, includes it, or takes it for granted.) This element of transcendentalism is not more than tacitly adjoined. It is soon to subside, and apparently to be lost—yet only apparently, because it is destined to vitalize consciousness later on: so it is here like a seed planted in a fit soil. The gradual disappearance of the transcendental is in the *choice of a King*, told in the books of Samuel. The leader chosen from among the people is the desire to be led by one's own principles. The anointing as the Divine indication is the recognition that all true leadership is a Divine gift and ought to be recognized as such. The becoming hereditary of the royalty, told in the first book of Kings, is, among other things, the loss of that recognition of the Divine.

While one recognizes readily a decadence from a state of being freely taught and led by a supreme Divine authority to the vulgar choice of being led by self; still it must not be lost sight of, that the decadence is an appearance, rather than a reality: for the fact is, man is destined to become a responsible free agent, or in the larger circle, the human race—the mass of humanity—is to become a free and responsible humanity. In this freedom and responsibility

the Divine element need not be absolutely lost—but it can be taken up voluntarily. In the conscious acknowledgement and embrace of the transcendental as Divine lies the fuller value of the Divine for humanity and manhood. We therefore say, the apparent descent of the path, the decadence though seemingly evil, is a process of emancipation, and as a universal psychological step is an advancement and a step in the forward movement.

This emancipatory step, so interestingly parallel with the period in the opening human life, which we term the time of one's education, is emphasized by the medium of education. The individual receives his education through teachers; that is to say education is the influence of a responsible agent upon an immature intelligence until it also becomes responsible. Before the world was intelligently conscious of its responsibility that responsibility was in, and guarded by the Divine, which always is the first and remains the essential human Teacher until human intelligence can be consciously moulded by, and imitates the Divine Teacher. The Divine Teacher is the Word, the Divine Intelligence accommodated to the immature human intelligence.

When humanity became conscious of its intelligence, and so responsive to its expansive influence, the possibility for propagating the teaching medium among men was at hand. This perpetuating of the teaching medium among men is the giving of a *permanent* Word as such a teaching medium. Making permanent the Word is precisely the characteristic of the Israelitish age; it begins with the giving of the ten Commandments upon tablets of stone. Around this gathers in historic fabric, in poetry, in prophecy, the education of a race, the model for advancement to freedom and rational responsibility—to full manhood.

The completion of the teaching is followed by the desire of an application for the production of results which must be upon a stable basis resting in the earthly conditions. Man cannot produce the conditions of his life, but must live his life under given stable conditions. The application of human intelligence to stable conditions is typified by the possession of the land. The possession of the land is

the end of this period and indicates that the proximate end of intellectual development is the intelligent possession of the earth and its riches.

The age of education is largely the development of language to the complete power of self expression. In a certain aspect education is the guidance to the self expression of intelligence, and this is the development of expression in speech. It would lead too far to enter into the details of this meaning, but we cannot fail to notice with extreme interest the inestimable importance of the discovery in this age of the phonetic elements in speech, for the Hebrew language is the first to develop what we now call an alphabet; its alphabet is the mother of all modern alphabets. The production of the alphabet is itself the result of a long analysis underlying the process of observing detail and connecting it into series and law. Its use is eminently the development of judgment. Its final command is a truly crowning attainment in the educational process.

In order to give definiteness to this age it might be said that the Israelitish age is to the human age what is parallel to the age of the individual from the tenth to the twentieth year (allowing much for the great variety in different individuals). One thing needs however to be prominently kept in mind, it is the age, preponderatingly intellectual, the age of strongly intellectual development, an age in which the will is not attended to, and, if the will shows itself, it is wild, sporadic, uncontrolled. This crops out especially in the sexual relationship, so prominently vagarious in the lives of David and Solomon.—The conscious division between intellect and will is preparing and follows in the division of the kingdom in the following age. The painful attention to that other faculty is to come, but come it can only after the intellect has become fully developed. This development crops out in so many of the Davidic Psalms. Most clearly and wonderfully it is expressed in that most perfect acrostic,

“Thy Word is a lamp to my feet
And a Light unto my path.” (Psalm cxix.)

J. E. WERREN.

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.*

It is not strange that there should have set in a reaction in the Protestant body against the extreme results which have been led to by the generally popular tendencies of religious individualism and subjectivism,—or the making of every man the author of his own religion, his own revelation, his own authority. This tendency is undoubtedly a stream in the general current of the democratic movement manifest everywhere and in all human interests, political and social as well as religious. Perhaps the real danger of an irrational and uncontrolled extreme of this individualism ending in mere anarchy and lawless license, is more visibly manifest in great political and industrial upheavals; but the churches have felt at last the trembling in the foundations, which is the result of their own too indiscriminate fondling of this idea of religious freedom as identical with religious lawlessness, and of the highest exercise of freedom as being that of destroying all the barriers of external authority.

The free criticism of the Scriptures, the handling of miracles and of supernatural and spiritual realities as if they were like the material world, the field for scientific probing and final judgment, has been claimed as the richest outcome of the whole Protestant Reformation, and the making over of religion and theology into such as befits a new and higher stage in human evolution. So almost uniformly negative and destructive has this criticism been, so full of the pride and vain pretension of the human intellect in its self-assertion over the claims of faith and

**Authority: The Function of Authority in Life, and Its Relation to Legalism in Ethics and Religion.* By A. v. C. P. HUIZINGA. Boston: Sherman, French & Co., 1911. 270 pp., 8 vo. \$2.25 net.

Freedom and Authority in Religion. By EDGAR Y. MULLINS, D.D. Philadelphia: Griffith and Rowland Press, 1913. 410 pp. 12 mo. \$1.50 net.

religious feeling, that to a New-Churchman the great body of recent Bible criticism and theological discussion has been not only unattractive but positively dismal and repulsive. A glance into the pages of a book discussing the nature of God while still doubting the being of God, or the nature of revelation while doubting or denying that revelation exists, or the nature of the life after death while doubting whether the soul be immortal, has been enough to characterize such a work as unworthy of the attention of a New-Churchman whose whole view of life and the world rests upon these great affirmations as beyond the realm of question, and as being a part of the very fact of human living. To the New-Churchman man is man because God is Essential and Infinite Man; God is known because the very beginning of creation is in the WORD, i.e., in God's revelation of Himself; man is immortal because it is the material body only that dies, man being himself a spirit; and finally the relation of matter and spirit, or body and mind, runs through the entire universe of God's creating, giving everything natural its spiritual correspondent, and so making possible a Bible whose literal sense is human and natural in form, while its interior content is spiritual, reaching up in successive planes to the Infinite Truth, or the Word in God Himself. All this forms the actual working material of a New-Churchman's thinking and observing and believing. It becomes hard for him to take an interest in pursuing the efforts of negative criticism for criticism's sake, or as a purely intellectual exercise and contest. It is possible that the New Church, from its very natural apathy and distaste for this superficial handling of spiritual things by those whose highest idea of spirit is that of electricity or a series of psychologic shocks, may become too blind and insensible toward the popular currents of thought, too unappreciative of that which is high and worthy in these intellectual strivings, and so lose in ability to adapt its own illumined teaching to the helping of those around us who are feeling more and more the need of help and the insufficiency of present resources in criti-

cism and research to meet the real spiritual wants of men at this time.

The more we learn what this real condition is, and especially as we learn that it embraces its constructive and affirmative side and not the negative only, the more we shall see the wonderful significance of that "*nunc licet*" statement of Swedenborg:—that "now it is allowed to enter with the understanding into the mysteries of faith." The great standards, those eternal mysteries of faith, still remain,—the monuments of a great irrecoverable past, as some would think,—God, Revelation, Incarnation, Immortality; but how, on what Authority, henceforth to be believed,—how to be practically maintained and utilized in the future of human progress,—how, in a word, not to be dropped out of mind as things no longer of vital but of merely historic and esthetic interest,—these are the issues involved in the present revival of interest in the subject of Authority in Religion, and in the evidently sincere, however handicapped, efforts "to enter now with the understanding into the mysteries of faith."

The perusal of the two works now before us would help any intelligent New-Church reader more than perhaps anything else available to realize what advantage he possesses in his knowledge of New-Church Doctrines, in entering "intellectually" into these themes so earnestly, sincerely and searchingly discussed by writers who are evidently most sincere in their desire to believe, and to help remove the obstacles in the way of their own and of others' believing.

In the first of the above named works, "The Function of Authority in Life," etc., the author, Mr. Huizinga, pursues his theme from the standpoint of outright affirmation of faith in religion and in authority as its necessary basis. He discusses authority from the basis of the Roman Catholic idea, or that of Dogma and Decree, and from that of the Protestant idea, which he defines as the sanction of *inward conviction* in her creed. "The Bible and the Church are norms from which the individual starts in his own interpretation." After presenting a series of interesting cita-

tions, many of them of considerable length, from a variety of prominent thinkers, Catholic and Protestant, this author "falls back then on the old evangelical position in which the soul finds satisfaction in its personal effort to reach the transcendent ideal For the solitary soul the one supreme concern of man, religion, discloses duty as personal responsibility to divine commands; not, however, in the Kantian sense "as if," but "because of the impress of God."

Mr. Huizinga's discussion of the subject of Authority is in three parts. In the first he treats of Authority in its Psychological and Sociological Aspects, including such topics as Authority and Liberty, Church and State, Moral Obligation, Roman Catholicism and Freedom of Conscience, Philosophies of the Day and Revealed Authority. In treating of education, he thinks the intellectual or scientific methods have been pushed to the crowding out of the personal or voluntary. He mentions ex-President Eliot's proposal to make a "judicious selection of beliefs," "as if beliefs were taken up or discarded at our discretion. But the intellect may not solve the old problem of the 'what, whence, whither' of man." The final authority is not arrived at by long disquisition. It is not discovered. We were graciously placed in the midst of the Absolute Ideal dissolving all legal questions or vacillations by the assurance "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." "We confidently appeal to this revelation of absolute Truth as once delivered to the Saints and over which the Church stands guardian." Wittingly or unwittingly, the author seems here to have committed himself to positions which much of his book is given to disputing. He seems to deny the popular idea of the progress of faith by practical experience, or by evolution out of that of the original documents, and his making the Church the guardian of that faith is hardly different from the authority claimed by the Roman Catholics to fix the canon of Scripture, and determine how the Scripture shall be interpreted.

Part second treats of the Metaphysical and Theological Aspect of Authority, and includes a very interesting discussion of Individualism and Legalism, Sabatier's View of Authority, Bible Authority, Pragmatism and Authority, Materialistic Tendencies and Ritschlianism, Science and Faith, Subjectivism and Truth, and the Source and Guarantee of Authority. He refutes the claims of Pragmatism by charging it with self-contradiction when it asserts that confidence in the object to be allowed adds force to the endeavor, and yet does not recognize the highest form of this confidence, which is faith in the spiritual ideals. He quotes from Professor J. Macbride Sterrett's work on "The Freedom of Authority"—a book reviewed at length in this REVIEW (July, 1906), on its publication,—a forcible argument against the pretensions of Pragmatism.

"[In Pragmatism] what is called Truth and Reality consists in bare practical effects. . . . In morals, if honesty is the best policy, then honesty is the truth. In philosophy, if we can get more out of our moral and religious life by believing in polytheism instead of monotheism, then polytheism is the truth,—which is practically the view of Professor Howison and Professor James." He quotes from Professor James's work on "Pragmatism" (p. 218) the statement, "Our account of truth is an account of truths in the plural, of processes of leading, realized *in rebus*, and having only this quality in common, that they pay."

Among the many valuable witnesses to the importance of authority in religion, and in fact the only one quoted in the two books under review approaching the New-Church source of authority, is that of Professor T. Cannegieter, a Dutch writer, who says in his work *De Taak en Methode*,—"Through our indivisible spiritual nature, we are in personal, direct relation with God. He gives us—He only knows how—the impression of His Presence and relation to us. . . . The first point of all religion is God who is known *because He revealed Himself*. . . . Everything finite is considered as belonging to Him only;

God revealing Himself is the primordial source of all religion. When did this revelation begin. It coincides with creation; it began when man commenced his psychic life equipped for the reception of this revelation. As the eye is teleologically fitted for the reception of light, so is the soul of man fitted for the reception of God."

If it were only for bringing to men an illumined passage like this, we would feel largely indebted to our author; but in fact his book is largely given to brilliant and characteristic passages from a very wide range of the foremost writers on philosophy and religion, so much so that the book constitutes a very engaging panorama of religious beliefs. The writer narrates rather than criticizes; and the New-Church reader will find in his engaging style and liberal range of citations an introduction to the religious thought of our time that will greatly help to clarify and intensify his own doctrinal beliefs, and his assurance of the reliability of the authority on which these rest.

If we were to offer a mild word of criticism, we would mention the lack of a clear, final definition of the author's own view of the real source of religious authority. To accept "the faith once delivered to the Saints," is today not to define that authority in intellectual terms, and yet this is what the age seems to demand. We would have been better pleased if the author would have rid himself of the philosophic slang which is adopted by a class of modern writers as if for maintaining a kind of closed circle of the initiated only; as, for instance, in the repulsive use of the word "function" as a verb.

As Mr. Huizinga seems to do, whether by his professorial association or by spiritual affinity with Princeton University and its Calvinistic orthodoxy, so does Professor Edgar Young Mullins, D.D., LL.D., President of, and Professor of Theology in, the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., the author of the second of the works here under notice, "Freedom and Authority in Religion," represent the kind of open-mindedness and frankness of speech characteristic of writers of the Baptist

denomination. Unlike the work of Mr. Huizinga, that of President Mullins is one of constructive criticism; it attempts the building up of a doctrine of Freedom and Authority which shall avoid both the fixed dogma of the Roman Catholics and the variable and indefinite subjectivism of the popular modern schools, whether of the Rationalism and the Ritschlianism of the Germans, or of the Symbolism and the Fideism of the French. To steer a clear course between these extremes and establish something objective, fixed, and authoritative, allowing for the mathematical determinism of science and for the freedom of personality, is the task undertaken. The argument is in eleven chapters, treating in their order of The Modern Ideal of Freedom, The Consciousness of Jesus and the New Testament Records, The Intractable Residues of Science, The Unstable Equilibrium of Philosophy, Voluntarism and Authority or the Religi-assimilation of Truth, The Principle of Authority, The Nature of Religion, Religious Knowledge, The Authority of Jesus Christ, and The Place of the Bible in Christianity, followed by a Summary and Conclusion. The survey is comprehensive, the analysis is deep and clear, and the author's style is lively and engaging, making the book very interesting reading, and an admirable introduction to present thought in religion and philosophy.

In the course of the argument we find a note of peculiar importance in the author's reply to the modernist's assertion that science renders impossible the maintainance of the old faith in the Bible, where he says, in brief, that while Science may be on the side of the higher criticism as to its methods of research, it will have nothing to do with the questions regarding the miraculous and the supernatural, recognizing these as entirely out of its proper sphere of discussion. The responsibility of rejecting these features of the Bible cannot therefore be thrown back upon the scientist; it is the assumed believers in a divine and a supernatural order who are really responsible for the casting away of these portions of the Bible under the pretense

of the "demands of science." In connection with the relation of science to religion, we find such sensible assertions as these:—

"The conceptions of the Soul, Freedom, Immortality and God, are the intractable residues of science; that is to say, they resist all the efforts of exact science to deal with them. Science is compelled to abandon them altogether, and acknowledge her own incompetency. And yet it is these four realities or assumptions which constitute the foundation of religion. Religion, therefore, begins where science ends. It has to do with a group of objects which never come within the range of the scientific vision at all. The conclusion is obvious. It is that, fundamentally, religion never can hope for scientific validation and justification, unless science shall change her present methods, or add to them new methods of discovering truth, and in particular shall admit a criterion of truth and explanation *other than physical causation.*" (Italics ours).

"Now it is permitted," says Swedenborg, "to enter with the understanding into the mysteries of faith." And this, we know, is because the doctrine of discrete degrees, or the true relations of God, Spirit and Nature as End, Cause, and Effect, and their correspondence, is now made known in the revelation given to the New Age and the New Church. The true causation is found in Spirit; Nature is only effect.

The author goes on wisely to say, "There are, no doubt, senses in which scientific criticism of religion is warranted, but this function of science must be limited to the sphere of religious phenomena. If science sits in judgment on the religious realities behind the manifestations, then she has passed over from the scientific to the philosophic sphere, the sphere of faith. She is no longer true to her calling; she can no longer be called exact science." When the author declares (p. 131) that "the present mode of expounding the relations between science is incorrect; it confuses the two spheres in an unwarranted manner," he is, unwittingly perhaps, asserting the doctrine of Sweden-

borg as to the absolute discreteness of degree between spirit and nature.

The author would establish the authority of the Scriptures on the basis of universal acceptance in the same way that science is established. The simple and the ignorant accept the dogmas of science on the authority of those experts who are scientifically competent to know and judge. So religion, he holds, speaks with the authority of those spiritually expert or experienced to those who are less spiritually competent.

In the last resort, however, it is the testimony of a consensus of spiritual experience to the reality of God and to the Bible's divinity that, according to President Mullins, constitutes the final authority on which religion rests. That this is sufficiently objective and controlling to one's belief to avoid the weakness of mere subjective feeling and preference, seems to find illustration in the author's discussion of the relation of obviously different, if not hostile, forms of Christianity, the "filialism" based on the Gospels and the "legalism" of Paul's epistles. However unlike these may seem, and even difficult to reconcile, we must fall back, he says, upon the consensus of Christian belief during all the centuries past, that they are equally authoritative as the basis of Christian faith.

"In fact," he says, "when we apply the criterion of experience to Scripture as a whole, we must take experience as a whole. We must make of experience a synthetic principle, not an individualistic one." It is difficult to see how this differs in principle from the Roman Catholic doctrine of the *semper et ubique*, the "everywhere and always accepted" as the necessarily true. The assumption that the Pauline legalism in the form of the Calvinistic doctrine of the vicarious atonement is and will remain the free choice of Christian experience, is a very hazardous basis on which to rest the authority of religion either today or for the days to come.

It is noticeable that both of these able and scholarly writers, while discussing the authority of the Scriptures

from the standpoint of historical criticism and of individual or collective experience, never once appeal to that supreme authority, the Word Itself. This sublime name which distinguishes the Christian revelation from all others, and at the same time declares its supreme and divine authority, is never used in their mention of the Bible or in their search for its authority. If they are pleading for authority in religion, why should they go to things outside of and subordinate to the Word Itself, even to religious experience, to build up this authority. If authority is the creature of belief rather than the author of it, what need of authority at all? Our authors would answer, Yes; but the canon of Scripture rests upon the choice of human judgment, the Church councils; and so it is through these that the Word is reached. The New Church answers to the contrary, that the authority is the Word Itself, incarnate in Jesus Christ, who says, "Search the Scriptures, for they testify of me;" and "beginning with Moses and all the prophets." He shows them in all the Scriptures,—the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms,—"the things concerning Himself." Likewise the Four Gospels and the Revelation bear the same intrinsic sign; they testify immediately of Jesus. They are in a sense the Word Incarnate in human language and narrative. "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches."

If the Word and its authority be only the outcome of a certain religious evolution in human experience, beginning with the first low glimmering of sense, then wherein does this system of universal authority differ in principle from that of the scientific evolutionist? President Mullins indeed admits (p. 395) that "Christ as the Revealer of God and Redeemer of men is the seal of authority in religion, and above and underneath and before the Bible." If this is the case, then is He not the WORD Himself? And if the Word was in the beginning, and all things were made by Him, then it is the revelation of this Word, this eternal Wisdom of God, the coordinate element with the Infinite Divine Love, that is the source of religion, and that has

given from the beginning, even from that primitive golden age typified by the Garden of Eden, the first torch of intelligence regarding the Divine and the Spiritual—the first real distinction between the light and the darkness, between the Tree of Life and the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, the power of knowing and loving God over against the power of the sensuous knowledge and the pride of self-derived intelligence.

Without the recognition of this primitive knowledge from revelation from that *Word* which was in the beginning, when God spake and said "Let there be Light, and there was Light,"—the reception of which by man in the childhood of the race constituted the Golden Age, or the First and Most Ancient Church or religion upon this earth—all search for an authoritative basis for religion and belief must be purely subjective and evolutionary. Whatever faith has illumined and inspired the human race throughout the ages in whatever zone of religion, has in reality rested upon some conception of a primeval "God spake; and it was done"—the Word in the beginning and its Creation. That this Word was what spake by the prophets, and what became incarnate in Jesus Christ as the "Word made Flesh," and what in the revelation of the present time in its inner spiritual sense becomes a Second Coming of the Word, not now in the flesh but in the spirit,—that here the Christian Church finds its true and only basis of authority, is the explanation that the New-Church doctrine offers of this intricate and hitherto perplexing question of authority and freedom in the Church. And this doctrine is free from the self-contradiction of those explanations which would represent authority as something in the process of making, even as God is represented by the evolutionist as the creature of man's growing belief, and religion as an experience resulting in revelation rather than springing from it. It is consistent with the Lord's own declaration: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free;" which is not to say that ye shall buy a religious experience void of revelation and

authority come to know the supreme authority, but rather that by an experience of the authority of the truth as divine, ye shall come into the freedom of that truth, which is the freedom of harmony with the Divine Order, the law of what is good and true, the freedom of heaven itself.

FRANK SEWALL.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE SPIRITUAL CONTENT IN THE PHILOSOPHIES OF EUCKEN AND BERGSON.

THE answer to the question, Is there a spiritual content in the systems of Eucken and Bergson, depends upon what is understood by the word spiritual.

If we have in mind Swedenborg's definition, that willing and thinking are spiritual but speech and action are natural, we have no hesitation in saying that both Eucken and Bergson have a great deal to say about the spiritual, for they both treat more or less extensively of intellectualism and voluntarism, of thought and volition as well as of action.

But if we take as the definition of the spiritual Swedenborg's statement that the spiritual is what proceeds from the spiritual sun, then we must say that in this sense neither Eucken nor Bergson have anything to say about the spiritual, for neither of them has any idea of the spiritual sun and what proceeds from it.

But perhaps there is a third sense of the word "spiritual" which we may point to even in Swedenborg's writings, namely, a certain quality of life opposed to the natural. In this sense Eucken certainly does recognize a spiritual element in the life of man, and it is precisely by this character of opposition to the natural that he most positively defines the spiritual.

Bergson has not as yet entered the field of moral and religious philosophy, and therefore we have only fragmentary glimpses from which to draw conclusions. It may be said, however, that Bergson's description of life has so many points of similarity to Swedenborg's doctrine of love that we may expect with the further development of his interpretation of

life, especially of its moral and religious characters, he will show more and more agreement with a true philosophy of love. There are two points at least where Bergson's philosophy seems to point to a possible spiritual development along lines made familiar to us by Swedenborg. First, his doctrine of freedom, and second, his doctrine of man as a recipient. His doctrine of *time* as the actual movement of life, and his doctrine of *images*, might be combined with the above in a way to suggest, if not define, the distinction between the spiritual and Divine very much in Swedenborg's sense.

But the truth is, Bergson has not as yet directed his attention in a systematic way to these fields, and consequently we can speak of his position on the subjects here considered only by way of implication and inference.

With Eucken, however, it is different, for he has written at length on religious and moral subjects and he has made emphatic and specific use of the word "spiritual." In fact he lays claim to be, if not the founder, at least the expositor, of a positive and definite spiritual philosophy. He has so identified himself with a certain view of spiritual life that he has been accorded a conspicuous place of leadership in the movements of modern religious thought. It is worth while therefore in his case to consider the question with which we started in some detail.

We are disposed to consider spirituality and Christianity as convertible terms. From the New-Church point of view spirituality is distinctly and peculiarly Christian.

"The Divine Love and Divine Wisdom which proceed from the Lord as a sun and make the heat and light of heaven are the proceeding Divine which is the Holy Spirit." (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 146.)

The Holy Spirit is the Spiritual by pre-eminence and by right and man as the recipient of the Holy Spirit becomes the possessor of spiritual life. In strictness, therefore, spiritual life as a thing of man's experience is the Divine life as received, but not the Divine Life as it is in Itself.

We look in vain in Eucken for spiritual life in this sense. For Eucken, spiritual life is not essentially peculiarly, or ex-

clusively Christian. On the other hand, there is a large and characteristic element of anti-Christian thought and sentiment in Eucken which removes the spiritual in the sense even from the realm of religion. To understand Eucken's doctrine of the spiritual life we must distinguish sharply between his rhetoric and his thought. And it is not always easy to make this distinction. We may say, however, in general that whenever he is on conscious religious ground he uses the language of conventional orthodoxy; when he is on the ground of deliberate personal conviction he speaks for the most part the language of naturalistic science and of traditional individualism.

It is a great mistake to treat Eucken as a philosopher. He is something of a historian and something of a moralist, but he is more than all a sentimentalist and a rhetorician. He has little capacity for deep thinking or definite expression. His thought moves in historically beaten paths, and sometimes he takes one historical position and sometimes another; sometimes a critical, sometimes a positive attitude. In language, he is sometimes Christian and sometimes anti-Christian; sometimes he is with and sometimes against the higher critics; sometimes with and sometimes against the orthodox Christians. It seems that he has never defined to himself clearly his position, historically or religiously.

In E. Hermann's interesting book on Eucken and Bergson we find frequent instances of Eucken's vacillation and indefiniteness.

The sum and substance of Eucken's spiritual philosophy in so far as it can be said that he has a philosophy may be compressed in the one word *Universal*. For him spirituality is universality. Man rises to the exercise of freedom when he rises into the realm of the universal.

The universal is antithetic to the individual, and on this ground Eucken denies that the Divine was ever focalized at any one point of history or in any particular individual. This is the anti-Christian outcome of his philosophy of the spiritual life.

The opposition between the universal and the individual he

interprets in the moral sense as the conflict between good and evil in the personal life. On the other hand, the individual is conceived in true Protestant fashion as the absolutely substantial and independent actor. Hence we have two opposing elements in his thought. The individual as such is morally and spiritually insignificant. The universal as such is the possessor of all moral and spiritual values. And yet the individual alone gives definiteness and significance to life. Individual autonomy is the essence of spiritual reality and freedom, and the autonomy is self-derived and absolute. The individual grasps, appropriates, if indeed we may not say generates, the universal. On the other hand, the universal is absolutely transcendent,—non-temporal and non-local. Consequently, Eucken denies that there could be any instance of the Divine completely embodied in a personal life in place and time. This leads him to deny that Jesus Christ is God. He maintains with naturalistic philosophers generally that the phrase Divine Human, or God-Man, is a contradiction in terms. His idea of God when stripped of conventional characters is in real substance merely the universal.

This brief sketch fails to do justice to the rich coloring of Eucken's thought and the moral earnestness of his personal character and life. In his genial sunshine a constant stream of students have year by year poured into his classroom, and thence have gone abroad to all quarters with inspiration and light. It would be a mistake to measure his influence in its extent or its quality by the philosophical significance of his fundamental thought. In a qualified sense we may say that his system, in so far as he has a system, has a spiritual content, but from the strictly Christian point of view we are bound to recognize that he is a representative of Modernism and a disciple of destructive criticism; that he moves within the limits of naturalism and historical German idealism.

L. F. H.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

IN this number of the REVIEW we print two interesting studies of social problems in the light of the New-Church doctrine of the Grand Man. The first, entitled "Special Privilege," dwells upon the endless variety of human gifts which contribute to the perfecting of society in this world and the next, and defends existing conditions for the most part as the natural outgrowth of this variety of talents and their application to the variety of uses or functions which men are called upon to perform. It finds no ground for the complaint that "special privileges" exist in any disorderly sense, and declares that if they should be found to exist, giving to any portion of the community advantages which are not afforded to others equally, they should be dealt with as setting at defiance the very principles of freedom and equality which professedly distinguish our age and our country. The second, entitled "The Doctrine of the Grand Man and Social Problems," believes that it finds such "special privileges" existing in so fearful a manner as to make an entire change of the industrial order necessary, to restore freedom and equality to a great majority of the inhabitants of the world.

There seems to be a growing realization of the fact that the progress of political freedom and equality throughout the earth in this New Age, has not been accompanied by an equal progress of industrial freedom and equality. Combinations of capital and combinations of labor seem to be in almost continual warfare, and it is difficult to determine which is the more tyrannical and oppressive, the trusts or the labor unions. Between the two men seem to be deprived of their freedom to work at will and for such compensation as may seem to them just and necessary for the proper performance of their functions. In these struggles both employers and employed need the protection of their freedom by the civil government. And the country itself at large is sometimes so distressed that it becomes necessary for the civil government to take measures for the common welfare, as in coal-mine or railroad strikes

which threaten the whole industrial world with disaster. And so it has come to pass that the civil government is entering more and more into the restriction and control of the industrial order for its own protection and welfare.

Now both of our studies of these problems agree that the civil government has a right and duty to do this. Mr. Reed quotes from Swedenborg (*Charity*, n. 77), to show that "every man is born to be of use to others," and that in "a well constituted commonwealth" laws will provide opportunities for everyone to work, with adequate compensation to sustain him in performing his use to the community. Both studies agree in this, and that it is a principle of government which applies to rich and poor alike. Every voluntarily idle able-bodied member of society is an undesirable citizen, and should be compelled to enter upon some useful service to others for his own as well as the common good. Mr. Swanton discusses this quite fully and shows how excessive wealth is as likely to foster idleness as excessive poverty, and it is well known that idleness is the fertile pillow of evil and crime. Swedenborg says, "In idleness man from the evils inherent in him is prone to indulge bad thoughts," and he calls it a "pernicious life" (*Heaven and Hell*, n. 361).

But Mr. Swanton, unlike Mr. Reed, feels that the evils which increasingly disturb the industrial world cannot be controlled by the civil government without a change from private to socialized ownership of the capital engaged in the production of the necessities of life; and he proposes as the simplest method of reaching this industrial condition the abolition of interest by making it illegal, as it was until comparatively modern times.

Now in regard to this we wish to make a few editorial comments. In the first place we should bear in mind that capital as a rule is no longer of private, in the sense of individual, ownership. It is already socialized to a very large extent. All the great industries of the country are owned by a multitude of stock-holders,—the majority of whom are rich, or rather, the majority of stock is owned by the rich; and they borrow from the people through the banks and insurance com-

panies all their savings, practically all, and pay interest to them. The conditions are just reversed, or appear to be, from those of antiquity when the poor man borrowed money to tide him over straitened situations in his daily living. It is the rich who borrow money of the comparatively poor now and pay them interest. And the question may be asked shall the poor cease to receive interest from the rich for the use of their humble savings? Or there is another way of viewing it. Individuals can no longer do the business of the world; it is too vast. Therefore great corporations are necessary, and the name corporation implies the co-operation of the people. It is a partnership method of doing business on an immense scale. It provides for the poor as well as the rich to enter into this partnership according to their ability to save and invest. The dividends may more properly be called profits, or earnings of the business, than "interest." This is just the meaning of the difference between bonds and stock: bonds represent money borrowed upon which interest is paid, but stock represents a share in partnership which entitles the owner to his proportion of the earnings of the business or industry. It is altogether an error of thought, it seems to us, to hold that labor alone is productive and entitled to all the earnings of the business, and that capital, which provides the conditions in buildings, machinery, and the support of labor while becoming effective, the *sine qua non* of labor,—is non-productive and entitled to no share of the earnings. But this is not exactly Mr. Swanton's position; although he seems to approach it in his illustration of the cost of production of wheat and coal. His position really is that the element of cost from capital should be socialized by vesting its ownership in the civil government instead of the companies of individuals who form corporations.

Now, this seems to us to be a purely economic question, to which the doctrine of the Grand Man would apply perhaps equally well in either direction. But the doctrine of Discrete Degrees might be found to favor keeping the two institutions, the civil and industrial governments, distinct from each other, as they are at present. And the more reason for this is seen in the light of present experience, for now we have a higher

court of appeal, as it were, in the civil government to protect personal freedom and equal opportunity when they are encroached upon by the industrial government.

But, however this may be decided by the votes of the majority of our fellow countrymen in the future, under Divine Providence, the socializing of the ownership of capital is sure to go on; for this is an age of co-operation in great enterprises for the common good. It will go on, we believe, until it includes all who are willing to enter into its usefulness in the spirit of service; all will share in providing the capital and in doing the work of the New Age that is dawning. But, as Mr. Reed shows, all will not be able to share just alike in either of these directions, nor equally, owing to the variety of endowments with which they are gifted by the Creator. Both of the studies do well, however, in making the money consideration of secondary importance. The main thing is that everyone shall find his own place of usefulness, and shall fill it faithfully. The money will then be provided out of the socialized production of wealth according to the needs of the use performed. Even as our Lord teaches, saying, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and its righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Swedenborg speaks of money as not a real blessing. He says that both dignities and riches are not real blessings, and that therefore they may be given to the wicked equally with the good (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 8939); but real blessings can be given only to the good.

The difficulty with many of us in facing the prospect of this socializing of wealth, and the just distribution of it according to the needs of one's usefulness in producing the common good, is that while we are disposed by necessity to leave it to the Divine Providence, we do not realize that the Divine Providence can work through human instrumentalities in a "well-instituted commonwealth," to use Swedenborg's expression. We shrink from the thought of an industrial commonwealth in which our usefulness will be measured up rationally by our fellow-workers, and our share of the common production of wealth measured out to us according to the needs of our work. But this is precisely what we must face and accept in the life

after death; and why should we not make the order of heaven the pattern of an ideal commonwealth, the guide of industrial progress, on earth?

But there is this great difference. Here our fellow-men by a system of selfishness wish to bestow upon us just as little as we can possibly get along with in doing our work for them; but in heaven by a system of love the angels will bestow upon us just as much as we can possibly make good use of—our limitations in the powers of service are the only limitations of their generosity. And this is what we should do, namely, all in our power to bring about on earth, a condition of industries in which every man shall receive all he can make good use of for the common good.

In heaven this produces great differences between the rich and the poor; but on an entirely different basis, to be sure, since it is that of love and justice instead of that of selfishness and greed. Still New-Churchmen should live with heavenly ideals in view, and work for the gradual realization of them on earth in the light of reason. But we should be careful to avoid the appearance of condemning the possession of great riches, and should not expect any leveling down of them, and leveling up of those of the poor, until a dead level is reached for all. Swedenborg says:

The lot of the rich who go to heaven is of such a nature that they find themselves in the possession of opulence beyond others. Some of them dwell in palaces, all the interior and furniture of which shine as with gold and silver; and they have abundance of everything that can promote the uses of life. They do not, however, in the smallest degree place their hearts on these things, but on the uses themselves. . . . Thus uses themselves are refulgent in heaven; the good of use shining like gold, and the truth of use like silver. . . . Good uses consist of a man's providing for himself and his family the necessities of life; in desiring abundance for the sake of his country, and also his neighbor, to whom a rich man can do good in many ways, which a poor man cannot. (Heaven and Hell, n. 361.)

Swedenborg's definition of the common good is interesting. He is writing of the occupations of the angels, all of which, he says, are functions performed by the Lord through them

as instruments. And all and each of these are co-ordinated and subordinated according to Divine order, and "taken together they constitute and perfect the general use, which is the Common Good" (*Ibid.*, n. 391). And so must it be in the "well-instituted commonwealth" on earth; all that promotes the general use, or service, of humanity,—all that keeps men busy in their respective occupations and relations to one another,—is the Common Good. This is the important consideration. Capital is the ultimate means of it. But whether it is socialized in the industrial or the civic organization is a wholly subordinate matter which should be adjusted to the changing conditions and needs of human progress. But the Common Good remains the same and must be the aim and source of life for every particular good, or individual worker. We read:

In the Lord's spiritual kingdom the forms of government are various, being not the same in one society as in another. The varieties are in accordance with the services which the societies discharge; and these are in accordance with the offices of all the parts in man, to which they correspond. . . . As these discharge different functions in the body, so also do the societies in the Grand Man, which is heaven. . . . But all the forms of government agree in this, that they all look to the public good as their end, and in that good to the good of every individual. This results from the fact that all the inhabitants of the universal heaven are under the guidance of the Lord who loves them all and from His Divine love provides that there should exist a common good from which every individual should receive his particular good. Every individual also does receive good for himself in proportion as he loves the common good; for so far as any one loves the community he loves all the individuals who compose it; and since this is the love of the Lord Himself he is loved by the Lord in the same proportion, and good results to himself. (*Ibid.*, n. 217.)

H. C. H.

"A PARTIAL STUDY OF A LOST ARCANUM."

IN this number of the REVIEW we publish an article entitled "A Partial Study of a Lost Arcanum." When a brother has been a devoted servant of the New Church for so long a time as William McGeorge, and earnestly believes that he has made

a discovery which far exceeds in value all the other services of his life, it is not for the editors of this journal, which is his in common with all the other members of the organization, to sit in judgment and arbitrarily decide that he is mistaken, and to close its doors against him. It seems to be their duty rather to afford him reasonable space to set his views before his brethren; but at the same time it seems to be their duty to express their own views of the matter just as freely as they would do if the publication appeared in some other journal. This we will endeavor to do in all fairness to him and the Church.

And first let us remark that it seems to us that the study would be more consistent with itself if the opening words might read as follows:

The terms *vir* and *femina* do not mean (in Swedenborg's writings), and should not be understood as meaning, *simply* a human male person, or man, and *simply* a human female person, or woman, but they should be understood to mean also (which is especially important for the purpose of this article) spiritual entities or beings; the *vir* representing the faculty of the understanding in man (*homo*), and the *femina* representing the faculty of the will; for these two faculties constitute and make man (*homo*), and also an angel.

For a little farther on we read:

The writer is perfectly convinced that Swedenborg did not expect or intend that this and many other distinctions would and should be seen by the superficial reader, otherwise the primary use of what he had written would be lost, and even the natural teaching rejected.

From this and other similar passages it is evident that the writer values the natural meaning of what Swedenborg wrote, at least for the times when it was written. In that natural teaching evidently *vir* means man, a human male person; and *femina* means woman, a human female person; and *intellectus* means the understanding in man (*homo*), and *voluntas*, the will; and these are the two faculties which constitute man (*homo*), and also an angel. Swedenborg had words enough at his disposal in the Latin language to express just what he wished to say without resorting to significatives which would make his meaning obscure and esoteric.

Now if the contention is correct, that Swedenborg intended that the natural meaning of his writings should be abrogated in the New Church of the future, and a significative meaning be established in its place, which should teach only of the will and understanding operating in individuals for the processes of regeneration, then all the beautiful and heavenly doctrines of the relations of men and women in marriage must be given up as annulled because intended for superficial readers in the past. We cannot believe that Mr. McGeorge wishes to teach this consistently.

Moreover, Swedenborg himself teaches that "whatever exists interiorly in man exists in forms which are substances; and whatever does not exist in substances as its subjects is nothing at all" (Heaven and Hell, n. 418). "Man cannot exercise thought and will at all unless there be a subject, which is a substance, from and in which he exerts those faculties" (*Ibid.*, n. 434). "The male and the female were created that they may be the very form of the marriage of good and truth" (Conjugal Love, n. 100). "By creation there is implanted in each sex the faculty and inclination, that they may be able and willing to be conjoined as into one" (*Ibid.*, n. 157). "Conjugal love conjoins two souls, and thence minds, into one" (*Ibid.*, n. 158). "That the will of the wife conjoins itself with the understanding of the man, and thence the understanding of the man with the will of the wife" (*Ibid.*, n. 159). It seems to us that these passages teach conclusively and rationally that to omit the man and woman from them, as personal human beings, would reduce the will and the understanding to mere abstractions having no form, substance, or existence, in other words, to nothing.

And it seems to us that this view is enforced instead of being weakened by the number (Conjugal Love, n. 127), which Mr. McGeorge misapplies so often to support his contention. Swedenborg is teaching, in connection with that number, that the husband does not represent the Lord, and the wife the Church, in the marriage relation, because both at once, the husband and the wife together, make the Church of which the Lord Himself is the Husband according to the

language of the Sacred Scriptures; and that nevertheless there are correspondences in the things of natural marriage, such as semination, proliferation, the love of children, and so forth, with the like things of spiritual marriage; and that these things cannot be understood without a knowledge of correspondences. Mr. McGeorge accuses others of carelessness, but here he seems himself to overlook carelessly the limitation of this to the particular things here mentioned, and to make a sweeping application of it to the whole book, saying that "unless a knowledge of correspondences has preceded," the whole book cannot be understood. And he refers to this number 127 repeatedly to support his contention with a wholly mistaken understanding of its import. Now as this number 127 is the chief authority for his theory of a significative meaning in the writings of Swedenborg, it seems to us that the contention falls.

And the confirmations drawn from so many passages of the "Arcana" and other works of Swedenborg, to prove that he teaches that *vir* does not mean man, and *femina* does not mean woman, are employed under a similar misapprehension of their application. For Swedenborg in everyone of these instances, is writing of the internal sense of the Sacred Scriptures, and not of his own writings; but Mr. McGeorge understands it to apply also to his own writings.

Furthermore, Swedenborg is not saying, even of the Word, that *vir* and *femina* do not mean man and woman in the letter, but that they mean the understanding and the will in the internal sense. This may be clearly seen in the following passage, which Mr. McGeorge cites among others:

In the Word, especially the prophetic, man (*vir*) often occurs, namely, man and wife, man and woman, man and inhabitant, also man (*vir*) and man (*homo*), and there by man in the internal sense is signified that which is of the understanding, which is truth; and by wife, woman, inhabitant, and man (*homo*), that which is of the will, which is good. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3134.)

In the first citation which he makes from the Arcana, however, this fact that Swedenborg is referring to the internal sense of the Word alone may be easily overlooked, especially

when the mind is prepossessed by the theory that there is a significative meaning within the letter of his writings also. For we read:

What is meant by male and female in an internal sense was perfectly well known to the Most Ancient Church, but in succeeding generations, when the interior sense of the Word was lost, this knowledge also perished with them; marriages were the chief sources of happiness and delight, and whatsoever admitted of any comparison with them they so compared, in order that thence they might perceive the felicity of marriage. Being also internal men, they were delighted only with internal things, viewing externals with their eyes merely whilst in their thoughts they considered the things which they represented. Thus external things were regarded as nothing, serving only as means to lead them to reflect on things internal, and from things internal on things celestial, and thereby on the Lord, who to them was all in all. In this way they were led to reflect on the celestial marriage, whence they perceived the felicity of their marriages to flow, and on this account they called the understanding in the spiritual man male, and the will female, which, when they acted in unity, they styled a marriage. From that church was derived a form of speaking, which came afterwards into general use, whereby the church itself, by reason of its affection for goodness, was called daughter, and virgin, as the virgin Jerusalem, and also wife. (*Ibid.*, n. 54.)

Here we are taught that marriages were the chief source of happiness and delight with the men and women of the Most Ancient Church. But we may be sure that it was their own marriages as personal human beings, *vir* and *femina*, husband and wife, and not merely abstractions in their minds, bodiless and unsubstantial understandings and wills; although they made the marriage of their minds of first importance, and that of their bodies of value only as it served the union of their minds, or souls; and thus as nothing in comparison; and still, without this ultimate of marriage of men and women in the things and relations of the natural world there could be no marriages at all. Indeed, we understand Swedenborg to teach this in his explanation of the passage of Scripture when our Lord says, "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven (Matthew xxii, 30.)"

Now it seems to us that Swedenborg teaches all these things,

both spiritual and natural and their relations to each other, clearly and fully in the letter of his writings, and that nothing more is needed, or can be gained by the discovery of a significative sense within that letter. But that the New Church does not yet pay adequate attention to the spiritual significance of all natural things and relations thus made known, we are ready to agree. And we further agree that if this were done, all the difficulties with the statements made by Swedenborg in regard to natural things and situations would be seen in so much higher light that they would disappear as of minor importance, if not understood in perfect harmony with the heavenly teachings which abound in his writings.

If Mr. McGeorge can "wake up" his brethren, as he says he wishes to do, to a keener interest in, and pursuit of, this spiritual significance of the things of daily life, so that in them they will be thinking more constantly of the things of heaven and of hell to which they correspond, and into which they are progressively introducing men according to their choices of good or evil in the use of them, his long and arduous studies in this direction will, under the Divine Providence, indeed prove to be the most useful and important of all the many and great services he has rendered to the Church he has loved so faithfully all the years of his membership in it. We cannot doubt that this is the true destiny of the New Church, to become so internal, or spiritual-minded, that its members will be delighted only with internal things, viewing externals with their eyes merely, while in their thoughts they consider the things which they represent. Thus external things will be regarded as nothing but servants of internal things, the earthly life only as a means of preparation for heavenly life, thus leading to thoughts and affections for heaven and the Lord.

H. C. H.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES.

THE INCEPTION OF THE LAW.

THE Children of Israel had gone down into Egypt and settled in the land of Goshen. Jacob died and was buried. There Joseph died also. Generations later the children of Israel increased greatly in number, and there arose in Egypt "a king that knew not Joseph." This king sought to destroy the infant Hebrew boys.

In those days a child was born to Levite parents. The mother hid him for a time, then placed him in an ark by the river's brink. The daughter of Pharaoh on the way to her bath spied the ark, had it brought to her and opened it. A tear trickled down the infant's cheek. She took compassion upon it, had it nursed by its mother, and then educated at the court of Pharaoh. Thus Moses was saved, and thus he spent the first forty years of his life.

The incident is exceedingly instructive. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob have died and been buried in the land. Infancy, childhood, and youth are ended, and the heavenly states then enjoyed are stored up in the interiors of the soul. Joseph, however, lies embalmed in Egypt. The teaching regarding the Lord in early life is a mere matter of the memory. It is preserved as a precious memory, but it is dead: it exerts no living influence upon the life of the individual. Some day it will. Some day Joseph's bones must be buried in the land, giving promise of the resurrection of the Lord's life in the soul. But before this is possible man must go through a state of preparation through the reception, and preservation, and growth of the Divine Law as his guide in life. The inception of this preparation is described for us in the birth and life of Moses.

The mere knowledge of evil or of things that are untrue does man no harm. But the time comes when the tendencies to evil seek to rule the man. Or it may be that mere worldly or selfish aims seek to rule. Then there is the king or ruler that knows not Joseph, that does not acknowledge God or the Lord. Man has reached the age of responsibility. Whom shall he serve? God or Mammon? If he choose to serve God, then he becomes conscious of the oppressive rule of Mammon, and must succumb to it, or learn how to overcome it.

The resolution to obey the will of God, and the affection with which it is cherished, are parents to the conception of the law itself in man. They are the real Levite progenitors of Moses. But how shall man's concept of the law, his concept of his duty to God, be preserved? Mammon desires to destroy it, and with it all spiritual life, all the Hebrew boys. Moses must be put in a casket and placed by the river's brink to save him. This is a most wonderful picture of the way in which the concept of the law of God is preserved in man.

Where shall the law be placed in us to save it? In exalted ideals? If it is placed among mere theories of righteousness, mere speculative theology, or ethics, or civics, it will perish. It must be placed in the very midst of the best and the worst the man has in his nature. The ark was made of reeds—wicker work. The reeds are types of man's opinions; his weak fallible judgment on human affairs. Speaking of John the Baptist the Lord said: "What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken by the wind?" A man with weak opinions swayed lightly in every direction by whims and fancies, or by the prevailing spirit of men? The reed is also used as a measuring rod. By our opinions we measure the character of others.

The ark of reeds was daubed with tar and pitch. This black inflammable matter represents our prejudices good and bad. Moses placed within this strange ark is a most singular description of the new concept of our duty to the Lord brought into the most intimate contact with our personal views and opinions on all manner of subjects strengthened and protected by prejudices and passions.

But the ark must be placed among the reeds by the river's brink. The law must further be brought into actual contact with the views and opinions of other men and women, and with the general stream of the thought of the world. What has the law of God to say about these matters? How do the commandments apply to our opinions and the opinions of other men, or the thought of the world? We make an honest attempt to see justice in all these matters. But just then when we investigate the Divine will in human affairs in the same spirit in which we investigate any subject of science or economics—Pharaoh's daughter opened the casket and looked into it—then we feel how helpless we are, how weak is our judgment—Moses wept; we must study.

First, we must learn the precepts of religion, the laws of the spiritual life under the care of the church. Moses is nursed by his own mother. Then we must study the relation of the law to whatever branch of knowledge in which the Lord quickens our interest. We must study with the end in view of judging right and wrong according to the laws of heaven—the Ten Commandments—and not according to human precedent, or expediency or self-interest. In this way we are delivered from many false conceptions of life. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 6753—the name Moses means “drawn out” of the waters.)

In time we exercise our judgment in human affairs with some degree of confidence. At the close of these first forty years of his life Moses went forth as a judge. He saw an Egyptian smite a Hebrew. He killed the Egyptian. And again he saw two Hebrews disputing and tried to set them right. But they refused to accept his leadership. In fear he fled to the wilderness where he remained for another forty years tending the sheep, and was thus prepared to return to his brethren and command their confidence in him as their deliverer from their oppressor in Egypt.

So in our experience our first study of the law gives us the ability to decide where the argument of the worldly-wise is clearly destructive of the spiritual life, or the life of religion. But when two within the church differ on questions of re-

ligion, when the church is divided, then though we may be able to judge intelligently regarding the issue; we are unable to determine that which is right, and leads man heavenward. Further discipline is needed. Further reflection, and especially further nurture of the brotherly affections—the love of others—pictured in Moses' care of the sheep in the wilderness. Without this we cannot see clearly the wrong in doctrinal differences affecting the life. While the beam is in our own eye we cannot see how to remove the mote out of our brother's eye, the fallacy in his way of looking at questions of religion. This is one of the most difficult things to do in this world—to help men and women to see the right in matters of religion. Religious differences—life differences—go deeper than differences in any other matters. And here it is hardest for us to see the right according to the Commandments of the Lord and help others to see the right too. But when, through discipline of the mind first, and afterward of the will, we learn to discern the difference between right and wrong in life's affairs, and the things of religion, then we are prepared to start on the journey heavenward. We are ready to forsake worldly aims, and seek at any cost the life of religion, which is a life in accordance with the Commandments as the Lord gives us to understand them in relation to our every-day affairs. A correct understanding of the doctrines alone will never make us living members of the church. Only by bringing our lives into harmony with the Word as we understand it are we children of the Author of that Word, which thus becomes a law unto us in all we do and say. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, nn. 6637; 6717). The doctrines undoubtedly help to disclose the deeper meaning of the Word. But the practical bearing of that inner sense must be worked out by each individual in his own way in relation to his own private affairs. As Moses elaborated the Ten Commandments in relation to the life of the children of Israel, so must we elaborate them in relation to our life present and future. The effort to conform to that alone introduces us into heaven.

There is a very remarkable lesson involved in the fact that as an infant Moses was placed in an ark of reeds, and that in

the last period of his life the Divine law itself was placed in an ark of shittim wood with the cherubim of gold over it. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 6723). At first the law can have no other point of contact with our lives except within that which is of fallible human judgment sadly mixed with good and evil. But in process of time when we have learned to apply the law to life, and advanced somewhat in regeneration the law is encased in something better. It finds a place in the heart, in our inmost nature, through the experience of the mercy of the Lord as our Protector from evil. This is the ark of shittim wood overlaid with gold in the most holy place. And the cherubim over all remind us constantly of the fact that the Lord protects each one from entering into the life of these Commandments—the life of the Word,—except in so far as he can be held therein to eternity. (*Divine Providence*, n. 221.)

LOUIS G. HOECK.

RELIGION AND LIFE.

NATURALLY the subject, "Religion and Life," recalls to every New Churchman Swedenborg's great definition of religion, namely, that "All religion is of life; and the life of religion is to do good." Here life and religion are brought together in an inseparable fashion—one being apparently merged into the other. Like many great doctrinal adages the words from familiarity have lost their force, if not their very meaning, and it is profitable to examine the statement carefully to see that we find in it something more than a fine sounding form of words, something very simple and practicable.

Looking at the second statement first: that "the life of religion is to do good" we are at once compelled to define what "doing good" is, and we remember the warning of the Church's doctrine, that doing good does not consist in acts of kindness and benevolence, in great charities, or even great self-sacrifice;

but rather in simply doing faithfully the duties of one's station and shunning evils as sins against God. This, says Swedenborg, constitutes real charity, the real doing of good. It seems at first like a pitifully commonplace and characterless definition of such a noble term as charity. But let us see what the definition really means. Half of it, the bigger half of it, is the shunning of evils as sins. But we must remember that once when a man came to our Lord and asked what he should do to be saved, our Lord asked him, "What is written in the law?" and on the man's repeating the Commandments our Lord said, "This do and thou shalt live." That is, the doing of the Commandments is living, and so it is the life of religion. But the trouble here is that if we examine the Commandments we shall find that all of them on man's table are simply negative, telling us the things we should not do: that is, the things we must shun as sins against God. So it is that the shunning of evils makes up so large a part of the doing of good.

But where does the positive part of charity come in? Where is the real good, the real exercise of charity or love to the neighbor? This part of the definition assumes that we are leading a life of usefulness, having our station and allotted duties, however humble and commonplace, in our relations to those about us.* It is into these very duties, these same simple, commonplace, neighborly relations that love and life—the love not our own, but the love of the infinite Father of love, flows down and out into the world, provided only that we—well, what have we to do with it? Why, that we keep the doors of that influx into our hearts and deeds open and not obstructed by our own evils—our own bad desires and thoughts which are forbidden in those last six Commandments. Charity is the doing of good, and so religion is to do good; but the good and the doing of it is the Lord's through us as His willing servants as we put away the obstructions in shunning evils as sins. Thus charity becomes no small thing, but a sublimely large and Divine thing—as large as heaven and as large as life itself—missing no single, humble act of duty faithfully done, even as the sun's ray

comes glittering back to us from the least particle of mica in the dust, or the least drop of dew in the meadow grass.

Such then being the meaning of the doctrine that "the life of religion is to do good," let us examine the first part of the doctrine, namely: that "all religion is of life." This apparently needs little explanation: perhaps what it really needs is our practical acceptance of it, and adoption of it in conduct, rather than in the life as a finely rounded rule of ethics. Having examined the second paragraph, that about shunning evils as sins, we see perhaps better the real force of this phrase, "of life"—that is, of the conduct of life in the shunning of evils as sins. In other words, religion which is of books only, or of doctrine, of worship, of profession, or of faith only, is not really religion at all: it is religion only when it comes down into the life. And into what life? Why, the life of shunning evils as sins against God; and, as the doctrine declares, the Commandments tell us what evils are sins.

Now this too may seem a barren picture of religion; but like the definition of charity, which seems so barren of man's magnificent benevolence and yet is so full of the splendor of a Divine altruism, of God's infinite love of the neighbor received through us—so this definition of religion is equally full of Divine and heavenly beauty and power. For religion means, we may believe, if we rightly trace its root meaning, the binding back. And as an element of human life it means, that in a man's life which binds him back to God his Creator, his Father, his Redeemer. There are these ties of binding back in every soul that is born. They are cherished and strengthened in the infant's life by the natural, parental love and fondling into which, there being no voluntary obstruction, the love of the heavenly Father flows. These ties binding us back to God are maintained in all the innocent affections and aspirations, the holy impressions and ideals, of childhood and youth, and especially in those impressions derived from the Holy Word. In these things the angels of the higher heavens are always near to children, and the influence so stored up, the binding-back ties so furnished, are

what are doctrinally defined as *relicta*, relics or remains, because these are what remain in every soul as the basis and means whereby in later, mature, and morally responsible life the Lord and the heavens may have an interior hold on the soul's affections, so far at least as to preserve it in moral freedom, that is, to keep it human.

When now we say in the language of the doctrine, All religion is of life, we see that what is contained in these words is the whole binding back and drawing back to God of the human race which has asserted its freedom in going away from the father's inheritance into the far country. It is the human soul awaking in the land of spiritual famine and saying, "I will arise and go to my Father, and say to him, Father, I have sinned; make me one of Thy servants." It is the consciousness in man of that love of which our crucified and glorified Lord said, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me."

And this drawing back to God, which is religion as an actual experience, is accompanied with the penitence of the prodigal, the confession of evils as sins and the desire to put them away, to become as servants in strict obedience to the Divine Commandments.

The power of Divine, immortal love drawing human souls back to heaven and to God, and by means of man's own efforts to keep the Commandments—this too is no barren waste in human living: it is the opened avenue through which flows the veriest and truest life, and the life which is happiness itself, the life of unselfish love. The Lord alone is the Source of this life, and as man is God-bound, or religious in this sense, this life is imparted to him; even as our Lord has said to us in His Word, as speaking to those who had been estranged, or drawn away from Him: "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly."

FRANK SEWALL.

THE RELATION OF RELIGION TO LIFE.

IN his latest book, "The Inside of the Cup," Winston Churchill discusses the relation of religion to life. The *Literary Digest* informs us that Sir Robertson Nicoll, in the *British Weekly* of London, describes the book as "a fresh interpretation of Christianity," and says that the author is credited with the creation of "the latest American Religion." Regardless of the Englishman's thrust at Americans for their readiness to adopt new religious fads from the East and from the West, there is encouragement here for New Churchmen, since this fresh interpretation of Christianity interprets it as a *life* dominated by the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, still alive and present with men on earth to guide and govern them. Never perhaps has the end of the old Christian Church been made so manifest, and the rapidly growing and widely spreading consciousness of the need of a New Christianity been so hopefully presented. And it is made very plain that this New Christianity must be, not a system of dogmas, or of abstract doctrines, but a *life* fulfilling the purposes of the Creator. Doctrine there must be, to show what this life is and how it is to be lived, but it must never lose its touch with the situations in which modern men find themselves hourly day after day.

Professor Rauschenbush once defended a multimillionaire brother of his own religious denomination from the criticism of having acquired his wealth by heartless and unchristian, if not iniquitous, methods, saying frankly it is the fault of his Church because she has never taught him in the past that religion has anything to do with his business and his daily life in the world; and the Professor made a plea for different teaching in the future, which was virtually a plea against the time-honored dogma of the vicarious atonement. He seemed quite unconscious of the fact that he was thus striking heavy blows at the corner stone of the faith of the Church of which he was even then a member and teacher, blows which would bring down in ruins all about him the edifice of doctrines in

which he and several millions of his brethren were accustomed to worship every Sabbath.

And so is it throughout the Christian Church, and the Christian world, today. Men are clamoring for reforms in politics, in business, and in religion. It is not because the evils of men in these various forms of human activity are growing worse—it is rather because their hearts, as a whole, are growing better and their consciences more acute. Their eyes are being opened to the light of the Lord in His second coming, in which it is growing manifest that Christians cannot do such things as they have done in the past and continue to be regarded as Christians. Political graft is seen to be inconsistent with patriotism, and patriotism is a priceless treasure to the nation and to the citizens who possess it. Patriotism demands the purification of politics at any cost. Industrial integrity requires a reform in business methods if not a fundamental change in institutions. Society needs a purification of thoughts and feelings as well as conduct for the preservation of the homes of the nation, and so of the nation itself and the human race. And the deepening and widening realization of all this has come from the restoration of a true religion, the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ in His second coming which is now searching into the hidden things of daily life and laying them bare in the light of reason. So the Church is failing the Pharisee as a refuge and hiding place for his iniquities; religious professions can serve no longer as a cloak to cover the real character of conduct; men can no longer be deceived by pious behavior, for the Lord's warning is at length being practically applied to the affairs of every day life, saying "by their fruits ye shall know them."

In this lies the power of this new book. It deals with modern Pharisaism, which is shown to be just as deadly to its victims now as of old. Eldon Parr, in his great stone house called by his Rector "a prison," is left by his son and daughter, and all his friends that "might have been," to suffer and die alone because he cannot repent at the preaching of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus, and make restitution to those whom he has wronged. Again, to such men in our own day, the

author leads us to hear the Lord's voice speaking with all the compassionate sorrow of infinite love the terrible words of condemnation, saying, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. . . . Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness" (Matthew xxiii, 25, 27).

The remarkable thing about Pharisaism is that it is so self-deceived. Whether it deceives others or not, it is bound to deceive itself. In crucifying the Christ of old, and in rejecting and crucifying the life that He would have us live now, Pharisaism always thinks it is doing God's service, because it is so utterly blinded by selfishness to what God's service is. After Eldon Parr had been placed under this indictment, with careful specifications of particular instances of robbing, schemes shrewdly devised to escape the law, a fellow vestryman, and a poor family who among hundreds of others trusted in his good name and business sagacity; and of driving a poor girl loved by his son into infamy, and of incidentally driving his son whom he himself dearly loved into the same ruin; he still protested his innocence by calling the former "accidents of business," and the latter "necessary to save his boy," adding:

"I don't pretend that I am any better than any one else, I have had to take life as I found it, and make the best of it. I conformed to the rules of the game; I soon had sense enough knocked into me to understand that the conditions were not of my making. But I'll say this for myself, I had standards and I stuck by them. I wanted to be a decent citizen, to bring up my children in the right way. I didn't squander my money, when I got it, on wine and women, I respected other men's wives, I supported the Church and the institutions of the city. I too—even I—had my ambitions, my ideals—and they were not entirely worldly ones." (p. 336.)

And then the banker went on to tell his Rector of the scheme of charities which had long been forming in his mind. He had already become the great benefactor of his city and

his Church. With his ill-gotten gains he had built and endowed a fine public library; and was even then providing a hospital and a settlement house that was to surpass the equipment of any other Church in the land. What was his astonishment, then, to be informed by his Rector that he was not, and never had been, a Christian, and never would be one until he became a different man, until he amended his life, and made restitution to those whom he had wronged, as a duty to God.

How like the teaching to which we are accustomed in the New Church, that public charities of this kind may proceed from selfish motives, and that religion has no relation to them until he who thus becomes a benefactor shuns the evils forbidden by the Ten Commandments as sins against the Lord! This is the only test by which Pharisaism may discover itself. One may wish and intend to be a decent citizen observing all the laws of his country; he may even wish and intend to be a faithful member of the Church, attending regularly its services and behaving in a devout manner, contributing generously in time and thought and money to its support and becoming its leading layman, as did Eldon Parr, appearing to be a most religious person; and yet religion may have no relation to his life, for in business and in society he does just as other men of the world do, excusing himself by saying, "the conditions of earthly existence are not of my making: I have to take life as I find it and make the best of it; if I do not look out for myself, no one will." And so he may live daily, hourly for himself, while the Christian religion bids him live for the Lord and the neighbor. When tempted he may think it necessary even to break the Ten Commandments for his own short-sighted interests, against those of the Lord and the neighbor; and he may think to atone for it by some great benefaction to the Church or the city: or he may even keep all the Commandments from his youth up, and shun all the evils they forbid as sins against himself and his own welfare in time and in eternity, and still not shun them as sins against the Lord. And so he may become the most blinded Pharisee of all, because outwardly his life appears to himself

and others so perfect, so righteous, so spiritual, while within, self is exalted and sits upon the Lord's throne.

This simple means of bringing religion into its proper relation to life did not occur to Winston Churchill, and this because it is not known and taught in any of the denominations with which he is acquainted. Consequently a certain vagueness is found where the greatest clearness is needed. It is true that the Rector takes up the lesson of Zacchæus's repentance, saying, "Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold" (Luke xix, 8); and bids Eldon Parr to make restitution to all whom he has wronged; but beyond that he seems to be unable to go with any definiteness, only saying, "What you are to do will be revealed to you if you have faith in the Lord." But in the New Church, while trusting none the less to the Lord's guiding Providence step by step, what we are to do always, and in everything under all conditions and circumstances, is revealed, namely, we are to shun the evils forbidden by the Ten Commandments as sins against the Lord.

And there is another matter which is left very vague in this book because it is very vague in the teachings of the denominations of the Christian Church with which its author is acquainted, namely, the nature of the Lord Jesus Christ, and His relation to the Father. Mr. Churchill really goes out of his way more than once to declare that He is not the Son of God, for the denial of the Virgin birth carries this declaration with it. And yet he calls Him the Son of God, saying, "Christ was uniquely the Son of God because he had lived and suffered and died in order to reveal to the world the meaning of this life and of the hereafter. . . . Nothing might be added or subtracted from that message—it was complete" (page 363). How this could be without the Virgin birth is not explained. It is taken on trust. "True faith is simply trusting—trusting that Christ gave to the world the revelation of God's plan. And the Saviour himself has pointed out the proof: 'If any man do his will, he shall know of the doctrine,

whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.' The Godship of Christ rests upon no dogma, it is a conviction born into us with the new birth. And it becomes an integral part of our personality, our very being." (Page 364.)

If we are to take all this on trust and confirm it by experience, why not take the rest of the Gospels on trust, including the Virgin birth? For then our faith would be complete, and the Lord Jesus would be in the letter as well as in the spirit, the Son of God. This the New Church is enabled to do, but with a full rational explanation of how the Father, the Creator of heaven and earth, clothed Himself with a human body and mind in order to live a Divine-Human life with men, not merely to show them how to live, but to make it possible for them to live with Him in the closest companionship of thought, affection, and service. And the Virgin birth was essential to this work of Divine love and compassion, not as an interruption of the Divine order of the universe; but as the only possible way of doing it in accordance with that order. To make Jesus His Son, after He had been born the Son of Joseph, would, indeed, have been a most inconceivable interruption and reversal of the Divine order of Creation as manifested throughout the universe. The thought of the Divine miracles described in the Sacred Scriptures in this manner, as interruptions of the Divine order in the creation of the universe, instead of as the Creator's use of His own methods, or laws, is unnecessary and unreasonable. How much better to think of the Father Himself becoming incarnate in human life, in order to redeem humanity from the hells of their evils, and bridge the great gulf thus fixed between Himself and them, so to become their Saviour. For salvation is the restoration of life with Him. And to live with Him is to love with His love, and think with His wisdom, and achieve with His power. This life with Him, growing ever deeper and broader and more powerful in service, is religion; and whether here or beyond the grave it is the life of His kingdom—here, it forms His Church; beyond the grave it is heaven. Hence we may see why Swedenborg

wrote, "All religion has relation to life; and a life of religion is to do good." For

He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good;
And what doth the Lord require of thee,
But to do justly, and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly with thy God? (Micah vi, 8.)

H. C. H.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT JESUS CHRIST.*

THIS book will be of interest to New-Churchmen for two reasons: First, because it shows how surely modern theological thought is forced to give up one idea of the Lord after another, until it comes to the conception set forth by Swedenborg; and second, because it gives a full account of the way in which fallacies concerning the Trinity crept into the Church in the early Christian centuries.

First concerning the latter point. We learn from our New-Church pulpit and in our doctrinal classes, that the New-Church idea of the Trinity is essentially the one that was held by the very early Christians, before it became obscured, and a tritheistic notion took its place. Here in Loofs' book we have this corrupting influence traced (pp. 185-198), beginning as early as the Greek apologists of the second century with educated Christians, who tried to defend Christianity against the pagans. These men mistook the Logos ("the Word," John i.), which John and later Ignatius rightly understood to be a particular manifestation of God, for a separate person. This was further confused by Justin, one of the apologists, who added the Spirit as a third essence. In the fourth century, after a long struggle, this dogma of the Trinity was hardened into orthodox doctrine.

As to the other point, the book traces the attempt of rationalists to make out Jesus to have been a mere man; and concerning this it says, that in order to do it, they are obliged to declare that the fourth Gospel did not come from John;

**What Is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* Problems of Christology discussed in six Haskell lectures at Oberlin, Ohio. By FRIEDRICH LOOFS, PH.D., TH.D., Professor of Church History in the University of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. 241 pp., 12 mo. \$1.25 net.

moreover, that it is not worthy of belief. "By so doing," Loofs continues, "it [the historical method] proves itself, from a really historical point of view, unable to do full justice to the sources." The fourth Gospel shows a self-consciousness on the part of Jesus which breaks the frame of a purely human life; and the experience of believers in all the Christian centuries confirms the assumption that the disciples of Jesus were right in seeing more in him than a mere man. This brings us to the Divine nature of Christ, and its relation to God. The orthodox doctrine of the Trinity has proven generally unsatisfactory, as being so contrary to the teaching of the Old Testament ("Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord") and of the New Testament with its loving Father. Several approximations to what the New Church would say is the correct view are given (pp. 222-241), ending with Loofs' own view,—those of Benson, of Seeberg, of Schleiermacher and Ritschl, and of Kaehler. It is with the last that Loofs finds himself in closest agreement. Kaehler understands the union of the Divine and the human life of Jesus, not as the combination of two independent beings, but as reciprocal interaction between two personal movements, a begetting action on the side of the eternal God-head, and a receiving activity on the side of the humanity. "In a progressive moral development, the human soul of Jesus had appropriated the contents of the life of the God-head, and the God-man manifested and manifests an increasing unity with God in the prophetic, priestly and kingly influence which he exerted and exerts on the human race." Loofs' own progress beyond this point is disappointing; and one could only wish, after reading his book, that Tafel's "Doctrines of the New Church," with its wonderful treatment of the nature of the Lord, could fall into his hands.

Besides these two lines of thought, there are many things of general interest in the volume before us. Especially, the earlier chapters of the work will prove satisfactory to those who have ever had to meet the idea that there never was such a person as the historic Jesus. To the question whether in profane history there is any authentic reference to Christ,

answer is made, that while there are several highly dubious references, there is one (there may be two) on which the utmost reliance may be placed. It is a passage in the *Annales* of Tacitus (completed about 116 A. D.). Here Tacitus, when writing about the Neronian persecution of "Christians," takes occasion to add a short notice about Christ. "The author of this name, Christ," he says, "was put to death during the reign of Tiberius by order of the governor Pontius Pilate. Thus repressed for the moment, the disastrous superstition afterward broke out afresh, not only in Judea where the evil originated, but also at Rome, where all atrocious and scandalous things from every quarter flow together and become celebrated." Another consideration bearing on the question is interestingly put as follows: "The Jewish theologians of the first and second centuries, whose doctrines and narrations are handed down by the Jewish tradition, were connected by tradition with the time when Pilate was procurator of Judea, and the preaching about Jesus certainly scandalized them from the very beginning. If they had been in a position to extirpate this preaching by showing that the whole story of Jesus who lived and died under Pilate was only a fiction, they would undoubtedly have done so. And if this had been the case, then the Jewish tradition would certainly have preserved some notice of this fact. This is an *argumentum e silencio*, indeed, but a very weighty one." (For further remarks under this head, exceedingly useful, let the reader consult pp. 33-39.)

The author shows himself to be, not only a scholar well versed in the history of his subject, but a man with devout inclinations. He points out that Jesus speaking to the disciples frequently calls God "your Father" and "my Father," but never "our Father." He sees a connection between the first chapter of John and the first of Genesis, not only by the words "In the beginning" introductory to both, but the part that the Word plays in each, since in Genesis the creative stages are introduced by "And God said." He makes telling and illuminating use of II Corinthians iv. 6, and v. 21, (*q. v.*) and translates and explains Philippians in two passages as follows: "He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant,

being made in the likeness of men." (ii. 7), and "Our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory" (iii. 20, 21.)

Finally we would notice the following short comments here and there through the pages: "Symbolism is coming to be modern." "It is nothing but a *fable convenue* of former liberal theology that Paul knew next to nothing about the earthly life of Jesus, or that he did not even care to know anything about it." "Just as no light is ever without lustre, so the Father is never without the Son." "It is pagan to think that God has to be reconciled by sacrifices. Even among the Jews sacrifices had a different meaning. They were looked upon as instituted by God Himself, in His grace, lest the Jews should forget His holiness when approaching Him. And especially the sacrifice of the covenant was but a token which was to assure Israel of the grace of God; it did not cause this grace."

We need not dwell on what seem the imperfections of the book. They are such as will readily occur to the reader as he proceeds, and of which he may make mental note while his mind is still refreshed and enlivened by constantly recurring periods where the light of the New Age seems to be shining into the darkness and to be apprehended.

HAROLD S. CONANT.

THE BOOK OF JOB.*

THIS new translation of the Book of Job is an effort to preserve the "volcanic outbursts of passion, with solemn appeals, bitter irony, eloquent moralizing, delightful reminis-

**The Book of Job; the Poetic Portion Versified, with Due Regard to the Language of the Authorized Version, a Closer Adherence to the Sense of the Revised Versions, and a More Literal Translation of the Hebrew Original; with an Introductory Essay, advancing new views, and Explanatory Notes, quoting many eminent authorities.* By HOMER B. SPRAGUE, PH.D., formerly Professor in Cornell University, afterwards President of the University of North Dakota. . . . Boston: Sherman, French and Co. 1913. pp. 243, 16 mo. \$1.25 net.

cences, pathetic moanings, stern imprecation" in all their dramatic and poetic beauty. The translator avows his wish to retain the "pungency" of the original, and allows many passages to stand which are abrupt and fragmentary, but which infuse into the discourse a life and power that would otherwise be lacking. In his notes, he compares Job to a "pre-historic Browning, obscure from condensation and ellipsis." Much of this ellipsis he credits to original intention. Thus the abrupt and mixed enumeration of human crimes, which are as though God marked them not (Job, xxiv, 2-17), the author, with Tayler Lewis (in the latter's Rhythmical Version of Job), regards "as though the passionateness of the speaker carried him out of all method," comparing the art with which such impressions are rendered with that of a Dickens or a Hugo; and in further advancement of this view he says (p. 200): "If we regard Job as all the while of sound mind, the difficulties arising from his frenzied utterances, inconsistencies, and abrupt incoherencies appear insoluble. It enhances the pathos of the situation to conjecture that, under the stress of terrible afflictions, his brain may have become at times disordered."

The noble twenty-eight chapter, he remarks, "reads like a sublime soliloquy, spoken by Job in a lucid interval. Incredible anguish of body and soul had preceded it, darkest and bitterest pessimism with luminous flashes interspersed of glad and glorious faith; and now to this poor exhausted frame an hour of peaceful rest has come" (p. 201). In the twenty-ninth chapter, verses 11 to 20 are obviously parenthetical, since verse 21 follows naturally after 10. The dislocation may possibly imply a new tendency in the mind of the sufferer to wander; for after this picture of a pure and noble life, "with the recurring violence of his disease, the frightful contrast between the past and the present looms up more terribly than before;" and chapter thirty raves of outcasts, cave-dwellers, gloomy gorges, nettles, thick darkness, terrors, the beast brood, no helper!

These explanations clear up much that was obscure; but there remains still the essential riddle of the whole story:

How can a writing which pretends to justify the ways of God to man, countenance so glaring an injustice as that described in the Prologue of the first and second chapters? If this episode in the trial for life of an innocent man be an "experiment" with a human soul, suggested with devilish cunning by "the adversary," but countenanced by God's permission, this does not relieve the performance of its apparently cruel and unnecessary aspect as a literal narrative. If, however, the whole story be regarded as an allegory, a rational explanation of the mystery can be educed; and this is the author's view, brought out in his introductory essay. The learned "doctor" Eliphaz, instead of prescribing emollients, has exacerbated the wound by criticism, basing his treatment on the mistaken hypothesis (honestly held, however), that divinely permitted disaster implies iniquity in the victim; and his coadjutors consent to this diagnosis. In vain does Job protest against the injustice of his three friends, who, of all men, should know him to be blameless; nor after they have been silenced, does he fare any better at the hands of the young enthusiast, Elihu; while the voice of Jehovah out of the whirlwind, majestic though its message may be, fails to solve the riddle. Not in nature's "colossal engine, incapable of immobility, irresistible, irresponsible, remorseless," is to be found the reason for all that transpires in the life of man; but out of the innermost heart of nature, from that love which includes both nature and man in its embrace, out of that tender and helpful divine sympathy which overrules the tempest for good, comes the permission of evil; for "we must recognize the essential utility to [man] of the countless inevitable drawbacks, difficulties, disasters even, if we are to be other than mere machines, puppets, automatons, at best weaklings and cowards. Without struggle, no strength; without the possibility of vice, no virtue; without battle, no progress. So, through numberless ages, with many a reflux wave, the tide of being, obedient to a supernal attraction, has risen higher and higher, mercifully merciless, sinking inferior forms and races in euthanasia in order that more eugenic, more precious might emerge" (p. 46).

The author refers to the use of "ritualistic ceremonies (sacrifices, burnt offerings, prayers)," and "sacred numbers (two, three, four, seven, forty, one hundred, one thousand, two thousand, six thousand, fourteen thousand)," as indicating symbolism, and suggests a three-fold division: "In the Prologue, emblematic pictures veiling yet suggesting the past eternity; in the Poem, vivid realities with baffling mysteries of the passing hour; in the Epilogue, a prefigured consummation of all material and spiritual blessings endlessly progressive in the æons yet to be; and asks: "Is this *History*? . . . May we not call it all *Allegory*?"—all of which is in essential harmony with what Swedenborg says, as follows:

"The most ancient books, among which is the Book of Job, were written by mere correspondences; for when it was written, the knowledge of correspondences was the knowledge of knowledges; and they were esteemed above all others who were able to compose works most abounding in the most significant correspondences. Such is the Book of Job; but the spiritual meaning gathered there from correspondences does not treat concerning the holy things of heaven and the church, like the spiritual sense in the Prophets; wherefore it is not a book of the Word; nevertheless passages are adduced from it on account of the correspondences of which it is full" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 543).

The "moral" of the story is, of course, that "some time, somehow, somewhere, all darkness shall be dispelled, the abused vindicated, the lost restored, the wrongers converted, happiness outweighing all past wretchedness be enjoyed."

The final suggestion of Dr. Sprague is that Evolution is the key to the mystery. The "unavoidable distresses of innocent creatures," the disasters and destructions of nature—"what are they but necessary *birth-pangs* evolving new forms of life, better foundations, higher levels, nobler species and races?"

The successful manufacturer finds it necessary to follow the progress of invention, and every now and then to "scrap" his machinery and replace it by something better. A world

in the making requires the same processes, and the new birth "from above" (John iii, 3-8), is the Divine solution of the Riddle of Life.

The work of Dr. Sprague is both thorough and instructive. So far as the reviewer's knowledge goes, there is no better annotated edition of the Book of Job; and he wishes that many may have the enjoyment of its perusal.

FRANK W. VERY.

A HANDY SUMMARY OF MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

THE publication of Professor Kent's "Life and Teachings of Jesus,"* the fifth volume of his "Historical Bible," brings to an end a most enlightening and important work. It is an effort to treat critically the whole of the Scriptures, arranging them in chronological order, subordinating or omitting parts not regarded as of historic value, relegating to footnotes "parallel" or "interpolated" accounts. The effort is, however, not for mere annals, but literary and ethical, acclaiming "Judaism "the noblest pre-Christian ethical religion," and its culmination, Christianity, as a "spiritual force, emanating from God Himself, finding concrete and noblest expression in Jesus, but rendered continuously effective through his apostles and his faithful followers in all ages,"—a faith "he proclaimed by word and life" which "meets the universal needs of humanity."

The whole work is of the greatest value to ministers, especially to the New Church, putting us in touch directly and easily with a modern view of the Bible which has become widely prevalent in learned circles. It is an example of the aftermath of the radical criticism of the last two or three gen-

**The Life and Teachings of Jesus*, according to the earliest records. By CHARLES FOSTER KENT, Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. (Historical Bible, vol. 5.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. 337 pp., 12 mo. \$1.25 net.

erations, the reconstruction based upon what that criticism has left as Scripture and Gospel. Comparison with the authorized text shows us how much rearrangement was probably effected under inspiration in compiling a Holy Word out of the historical accounts and prophecies. Such prophecies as promise an actual manifestation of Jehovah as the Messiah to come, seem to be ignored or interpreted as figurative merely. Our Lord's own statements that He was this manifestation, are similarly treated, or regarded as metaphysical explanation added to our Lord's own idea of His mission by the philosophizing author of the fourth Gospel.

The treatment of the Virgin Birth is of especial interest. The deliberate omission of the accounts of it from the finished text and the whole discussion of the matter, show that the denial by radical criticism of such a conception of Jesus is based not upon real study of those accounts but upon a materialistic preconception. The Virgin Birth is assumed impossible; therefore we need not consider seriously the legendary accounts of it. They are beautiful additions made by the writers, or by those who compiled the original "sayings" and accounts, out of their own devotion to the person of Jesus, in the effort to magnify him more than he himself desired. Philo's reference to this tendency in contemporary writers, and instances of his similar ascription of virgin birth to Samuel and others, are quoted; but it is not suggested at all that this may be a reaction on the allegorizing mind of Philo as a boy of fourteen of the wonder of Jesus' own birth and all that was said about it at the time. In this, as in all similar treatments, we cannot but feel the inadequacy of the foundation for the great effects which are admitted for Christianity, if that foundation is a human, mistaken Jesus.

But if we are looking for a very handy summary of modern criticism and its efforts for reconstruction, in small compass and authoritative treatment, we cannot do better than secure all of these volumes, especially the last.

CHARLES W. HARVEY.

"THE INSIDE OF THE CUP." *

EVERY reader of this strong novel is certain to be set to thinking. While he may not agree with many of its conclusions, he will surely respond cordially to the author's drawing of the present crisis in the preaching and work of the Christian Church. To the New-Churchman, who has been oft repeating his favorite maxim that "all religion has relation to life," there is not much new in the contention that the present church is weak because its life is formal, and that the appeal of the church is empty wherever it speaks to self-satisfied people and soothes them with a long-accepted orthodoxy while ignoring their spiritual condition. But to one who is just beginning to realize that the true expression of religion is in doing good, there is a real thrill in following the conversion of Rev. John Hodder, an Episcopal clergyman, from a life of formal ministerial work along the conventional lines of a rich parish, to a ministry of active sympathy with the struggles of the worthy poor, and of concrete labor for the uplift of those who realize their degradation and need. The New-Churchman sees in Hodder's experience a picture of the restlessness that is troubling great numbers of conscientious Christians, and the craving for something vitally substantial in the doctrine and practice of the Church. But when the clergyman begins reconstructing his theological system for himself, he fails tragically, imagining himself satisfied rationally with mere iconoclasm, with the rejection of long-held tenets of the Church. He imagines he is doing constructive work for himself and his Church when he throws aside most of his Bible, substitutes a human Christ for a Divine Christ, makes religion center in man's relation to his neighbor rather than to his God. Hodder is humble while he is in error and groping for light; but when he begins to come out into the open of individual thinking on the problems of life, he develops an intellectual conceit that again blinds him. He loses the

**The Inside of the Cup.* By WINSTON CHURCHILL. New York: Macmillan Co. 1913. 513 pp., 12 mo. \$1.50.

capacity of being taught by revelation, and essays to fathom all depths by his own initiative. He falls into the same errors that have today come like clouds between the upward-looking thinkers and the "Light of the world" who is making His Second Coming. If Mr. Churchill possessed, combined with his power as a writer and delineator of character, the knowledge of the great fundamental laws of life, and the kind of rational psychology which he could learn from the teachings of Swedenborg as from no place else, his next religious novel would stir the civilized world and be an epoch-maker in the field of fiction and religious thought. A thoughtful New-Church person will be stimulated by the reading of the "Inside of the Cup" to a new rejoicing in the treasures of truth which he himself has gained from Him who has taught through His servant the real meaning of "the inside of the cup."

PAUL SPERRY.

RECOLLECTIONS OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON STEPHENS.*

ALTHOUGH this is neither a New-Church nor a theological book, there are some items in it that will be of interest to the members of the New Church.

Alexander H. Stephens was one of the most remarkable men in Congress during the ante-bellum struggles over the slavery question. He was a very delicate man (he weighed less than one hundred pounds), and yet an influential one in the forum. The writer remembers singling him out in the early fifties in the House of Representatives, and wondering that a man of such a slight frame could win so great a reputation as he possessed throughout the United States, or even make himself heard in a public hall. And yet it is said

**Recollections of Alexander H. Stephens; His Diary kept when a prisoner at Fort Warren, Boston Harbor, 1865. Edited, with a biographical study, by MYRTA LOCKETT AVARY. New York; Doubleday, Page and Company. 1910. \$2.50 net.*

that when he spoke, his voice rang out so clear and strong that he was always heard; and that whenever it was known that he would take the floor, the galleries and floor of the House were crowded. In 1855 it was said of him while on a political canvass, "He is nothing but lungs and brain." In 1843 Lincoln wrote to his law partner to say, "I take up my pen to tell you that Mr. Stephens of Georgia, a little, slim pale-faced consumptive man, has just concluded the very best speech of an hour's length I ever heard. My old withered, dry eyes were full of tears."

He was an entirely self-made man. His mother died in his infancy, and his father not many years later, after which event he lived with an uncle. He showed great proficiency at school; made his way through college on his patrimony of \$400 a year; then studied law, and after the usual delays and hardships, succeeded in winning a name and a place. He was never married. Twice his heart was touched; but on account of his health he never spoke. "A woman's due," he thought, "was a husband on whom she could lean, and not an invalid whom she must nurse." He deprecated slavery; but seemed to believe that the best way for a superior and inferior race to live together was one of mutual helpfulness and dependence. He was never a secessionist. He struggled with all his might to keep his State in the Union, but when it went out in spite of all his efforts, he went with it. He was afterwards elected Vice-President of the Confederacy, and though not without reluctance served in that capacity to the end of the war. He was arrested about the same time that Mr. Davis was captured; and they made the journey together toward their places of imprisonment as far as Fortress Monroe.

His diary during the time of his incarceration at Fort Warren is full of human interest. Toward the latter part of it he came in contact with Major J. M. Appleton and his wife,—we think, of Boston. Of both of them he seems to have formed a high opinion. On August 7th, while walking after a storm, he met Major Appleton, and later made the following entry:

"I had not walked long before Major Appleton joined me.

We had a pleasant talk on rather abstruse subjects; nature, creation, the cosmos, life, the intellect, the soul, the Trinity, etc. I find that he is a Swedenborgian. He promised to let me have some of Swedenborg's writings. I have been waiting to learn something of this great theologian's doctrines. The walk and talk were very agreeable. The more I see of Major Appleton the more I like him" (page 431).

The next day Major Appleton handed him "two pamphlets containing extracts from Swedenborg." The same day he writes:—

"Finished Swedenborg's '*Doctrine concerning the Lord*.' It is a master production, the clearest exposition I have ever seen of the doctrine of the Trinity. It embodies some ideas I have long entertained. But what seems to be his idea of the resurrection is not one of these. The Scriptural view is, I think, that our material bodies will rise with our spirits or souls" (page 433).

Later, on August 12th, before Major Appleton left the fort to go into business, Mrs. Appleton called "with beaming smiles," and among other things left some books, Swedenborg on "Heaven and Hell," "The Last Judgment," and others, "All works," he adds, "I have been desirous of getting for some time, and I am truly obliged to her on that account; besides I deeply appreciate her spirit of kindness" (page 452).

We find two entries regarding the two books mentioned, with which we close our quotations.

"Finished Swedenborg on 'Heaven and Hell, the World of Spirits,' etc. Many things in this book are obscure to me. If I understand Swedenborg, salvation is not the result of immediate mercy and grace, but the result of these combined with the acts and will of the recipient. These views accord nearly with my own. Divine vengeance, as taught by many, I could never comprehend. The Divine Being I was always inclined to regard as the very embodiment of love and mercy; punishments as the inevitable consequences of violation of law, moral and physical; Scriptural commandments and injunctions as admonitory, given to man to enable him to see

the law and to avoid violation with the consequences, as he has power to do through Divine aid and faith in the Redeemer. I believe, too, in the cultivation of the higher attributes and qualities of man, his third part, which I call the soul, just as I believe in the cultivation of the second part, which I call mind, or intellect. Soul culture is as distinct, in my opinion, from mental culture, as mental from physical; it has a sphere of its own, and is governed by laws as different from bare mental culture, as the laws of the latter differ from the laws of bare physical culture. In religious or spiritual matters, as they are called for lack of a better term for things relating to the culture of the soul, reason, technically speaking, has nothing to do. The whole lies in a sphere beyond human reason" (page 470).

"Last night read Swedenborg's 'Last Judgment.' Like his other works, a wonderful production. The first chapters I can understand: further reading suggests that he had poured over abstruse subjects, endeavoring to reconcile spiritual mysteries with the laws of human understanding, until reason lost its balance. Still, there is nothing in his explanation of the sacred text more mysterious than the text itself. Whether he was under Divine illumination or laboring under hallucination, I do not know; but that he was sincere, I believe" (page 472).

We like to believe that any candid man who can be persuaded to read Swedenborg with the appreciation and receptivity here betrayed, will go further and in some way ally himself with the Church. We would expect this of Alexander H. Stephens above most other men. If we may judge his character by what is presented to us in this book, and by what is more or less common knowledge of his public career, we must believe that he was an absolutely sincere man; honest, upright, incorruptible, fearless, and highly religious. In spite of all this, he seems to have gone just so far and no farther. He read without prejudice. He accepted much of what he read. He exhibited an openness to some of the most interior phases of the doctrines that is little less than amazing. But, so far as we know, he evinces no desire to go further; and

there is no record or likelihood of a record that he did go further.

It is idle, perhaps, to speculate upon the reason for this state of things. And yet may we not suggest that it was possibly because the New Church came to him, not as a new religion or dispensation of Divine truth, but as a theology or system of doctrine; not so much as a life that must be lived, as a theory that must be believed; not as a new Revelation from the Lord, whereby He is making His Second Coming as the one God of heaven and earth, the Redeemer and Saviour of mankind, but rather as a new philosophy of Divine law which appeals to the head rather than to the heart? If so, does it not teach us a lesson as to the aims and methods with which we should go to work to promulgate and establish the teachings of the church? Should we not avoid with the greatest care giving the impression that these Revelations are the discovery of a man, however wise or great, and thus putting them on the same level as any other teachings of any other man, instead of proclaiming them as the Lord's own opening of Divine Truth, and as coming with Divine power for the uplifting and salvation of men? Should we not, in other words, go forth to convert the world to a new life according to Divine Truth, instead of to the mere acknowledgment of the truth, using the truth as a means to the end and not as the end itself?

S. S. SEWARD.

"THE WINNING OF THE BEST."*

ALEXANDER BLACK once said, that "a pessimist is one who has tried to live with an optimist." But he must have had some other optimist in mind than Trine. Those who know him realize his convincing and fascinating optimism, and know that the little verse which opens this book,—

"The optimist fell ten stories,
And at each window bar,

**The Winning of the Best.* By RALPH WALDO TRINE. New York: Dodge Publishing Co. 1912. 100 pp., 12 mo. 75 cts.

He shouted to his friends:
'All right so far,'—

exactly describes the insistent and persistent nature of his optimism.

There seems to be scarcely any need of commenting on the sequence of things in Trine's books, because they are all aimed at the one point, and attain that point with facility and grace. But this book more than any other shows his appreciative study of Swedenborg, in which he has been engaged ever since what have been called "the Oscawanna days," when he and Edwin Markham were associated in the work at that delightfully nondescript place,—and Markham, as our readers know, is as earnest a student of Swedenborg as Trine. In fact, these two popular writers illustrate and typify the rapidly growing host of that class of students, not officially connected with the New Church, who are energetic teachers of the philosophic principles and theologic truths, to teach which the great Seer was selected by Providence. This last book of Trine's more than any other bears witness to the fact that he has made the great Seer's teachings part of his curriculum.

Take for instance the familiar sentence from Swedenborg: "All religion is of life, and the life of religion is to do good."

Trine thus quotes a paraphrase of this sentence from a "Noted Preacher" who says:

"There are many ways of being busy in this world, but there is only one business here. The great affair of man is living. It is not merely the earning of a wage, nor the making of money, nor beating one's rivals, nor electing one's candidate. It is the process of turning environment and endowments into character. It is making manhood" (p. 38).

On page 82 he gives one of his own paraphrases:

"There is no such thing as religion and a man's cheating his neighbor in the same life. There is no such thing as religion and a man's gaining anything for himself at the expense of his neighbor or his fellowman in general. There is no such thing in true religion as a Deacon or an Elder passing the collection plate, or the communion plate, or taking part

in any way in the administration of affairs in the House of God on Sunday, and going out and doing his neighbor on Monday."

It is, however, when he reaches the chapter on "The Power That Makes Us What We Are," and grapples with the Infinity within and back of man's life, that he quotes (p. 66) directly from Swedenborg's "*Heaven and Hell*." In the language now familiar to most readers of sane philosophy, who have not overstepped the boundaries either toward Shaw, or Schopenhauer, or Nietzsche or Strindberg, or any of the other representatives of merry or pathetic "insanitary thought," he says:

"We are living the eternal life now as much as we ever will, or ever can live it. The only heaven we will ever have is the one we realize, make and carry with us. We determine always *our own* condition—Heaven or Hell—here or hereafter. It was the teaching of one of the most highly illumined and valuable men who have lived in the world, Emanuel Swedenborg, that at that time [the author has just been considering death] there will be no one to judge us for our own acts: our own life *is itself* our judge. Our life here determines absolutely the condition of our life there. It is simply a matter of sequence. We commence there exactly where we leave off here. All mental and spiritual growth and unfoldment, that is, our real character, is what we take with us."

We advise our readers to have this book at hand, as an example of the influence of Swedenborg upon the mass mind and its teachers and the molders of its thought and opinions.

ADOLPH ROEDER.

ERRATUM.

The name of the distinguished investigator who has demonstrated that the Roentgen rays can be diffracted, and that they are in all respects equivalent to light rays save in their extraordinarily rapid vibration, is misprinted three times in the article on Swedenborg's "*Principia*" in the July number of the REVIEW. For Dr. M. "Lane" (p. 392, l. 1, p. 393, l. 8 from bottom, and p. 408, l. 12), the reading should be Laue.

Standard New-Church Books

The Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg. With Portrait. Benjamin Worcester	\$2.00
Swedenborg: Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church. Benjamin Worcester	1.25
Swedenborg and the New Church. James Reed	50 cents
The Divine Word Opened; Sermons. Jonathan Bayley	1.00
A Life of Emanuel Swedenborg. George Trobridge	1.00
Discrete Degrees in Successive and Simultaneous Order. Nathan C. Burnham. Illustrated by Diagrams.	4.00
Dictionary of Correspondences.	1.25
General Index to Swedenborg's Scripture Quotations. Arthur Hodson Searle	3.00
The Nature of Spirit and of Man as a Spiritual Being. Chauncey Giles	50 cents
Foundation Truths of the Christian Religion; passages selected from Swedenborg	50 cents
The Science of Correspondences Elucidated. Edward Madeley	1.50
Swedenborg's Doctrine of Correspondence. Lewis P. Mercer	75 cents
An Appeal in Behalf of the Views Held by the New Church. Samuel Noble	75 cents
Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg. Theophilus Parsons	50 cents
The Swedenborg Concordance. 6 vols. Cloth	24.00
Swedenborg and the Doctrines of the New Church. Rudolph L. Tafel	1.75
Bibliography of the Works of Emanuel Swedenborg; original and translated. Rev. James Hyde	10.00
Compendium of the Theological Writings of Swedenborg. Samuel M. Warren	1.50
Correspondences of the Bible: Animals. John Worcester	1.00
Correspondences of the Bible: Plants, etc. John Worcester	1.00
Physiological Correspondences. John Worcester	1.00
Lessons in Correspondences. Wm. L. Worcester	50 cents
Commentary on the Psalms. Compiled from Swedenborg	1.25
Commentary on Matthew. Compiled from Swedenborg	1.25
Commentary on John. Compiled from Swedenborg	1.25
Life: Its Nature, Varieties, and Phenomena. Leo H. Grindon	1.00

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION
134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON

Swedenborg's Theological Works

- Heaven and Hell, 15c, 20c,* 50c, 68c,* \$1.25.*
Divine Love and Wisdom, 15c, 20c,* 30c, 42c,* \$1.00.*
Divine Providence, 15c, 20c,* 40c, 56c,* \$1.00.*
Four Leading Doctrines, 15c, 20c,* 30c, 42c,* \$1.00.*
Arcana Coelestia, ten volumes, each 50c, 70c.*
Arcana Coelestia, twelve volumes, each \$1.25.*
Conjugal Love, 40c, 58c,* \$1.25.*
True Christian Religion, one volume, 60c, 91c.*
True Christian Religion, two volumes, each \$1.25.*
Miscellaneous Theological Works, 40c, 60c,* \$1.25.*
Apocalypse Revealed, two volumes, each 40c, 58c.*
Apocalypse Explained, six volumes, each 50c, 70c,* \$1.25.*
Index to Apocalypse Explained, two volumes, each \$1.00,
\$1.25.*
Summaries of Internal Sense of the Prophets and Psalms,
60c, 75c.*
*Postpaid.
-

Price indicates difference in paper, printing and binding. Write
for full catalogue to

The American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society
3 West 29th Street, New York City

The Swedenborg Scientific Association

FRANK SEWALL, D. D.
PRESIDENT

Purposes :

To translate and publish the scientific and philosophical works of
Emanuel Swedenborg.

The *New Philosophy*, a quarterly magazine, contains the transactions and
papers of the annual meetings, and translations of hitherto unpublished works by
Swedenborg. The *New Philosophy* is now publishing a series of philosophical
papers by *Miss Lillian Beckman*, which are attracting much attention.

Membership and Subscription Fee \$1.50

Remit to E. F. STROH, Treasurer

1011 ARCH STREET

PHILADELPHIA, PA.